

THE STANDARD

NO. 76-VOL. 1. NO. 24.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 16, 1888.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

"The Standard" is sent this week to a number of persons whose friends have paid to have the paper forwarded to them for four weeks in the hope that they may be induced to read it, examine the principles it advocates and become regular subscribers. Those who receive the paper without having ordered it will understand that it has been sent in this manner and will be sent for four successive weeks without charge to them.

Terms of subscription will be found on the fourth page.

CONTENTS.

Chancellor Bird's Decision.
Over Population.
Home Life Disappearing.
"Believing" in France.
Queries and Answers.
The Boulanger Boom and Its Causes.
Pen, Pencil and Subjects.
The Law of Labor Strikes.
The Tariff Debate.
Limitation of Fortunes.
St. Louis Side-walks.
Plain Free Trade Talk.
Society Notes.
Kiss and Things.
Electricity in Production and Exchange.
The Seating of the Drums.
Louisiana Farmers.
Turned Off (poem).
A Morning's Story.
A Scrap of Railway Talk.
Song of the High Protectionist (poem).
To Workmen.
Current Thought.
A Fresh Air Dream.
Free Trade and the Single Tax.
Straws Which Show the Wind.

Governor Hill, as was expected from the first, has vetoed the ballot reform bill. He has filed with it a memorandum giving his reasons, which are of the most trivial character. His real reason evidently is that the bill would accomplish just what its friends expect from it—it would kill the political machines.

What the men who are bent upon carrying this great reform have now to do is to show that they propose to vote for it—that they propose, irrespective of party lines, to vote against those who oppose it, and in favor of those who support it. We cannot expect to obtain such a measure from politicians unless we prove to them that we are in earnest. The Central labor union, and its sections acting independently, have clearly shown what a hold the desire for this reform has taken upon the working masses of New York. They know from experience that under the present electoral system our politics must create bosses and develop machines, and that the first step to making our government really a government by the people is to take the power of money out of elections, put an end to bribery and intimidation, and give the voter the means of really expressing his will.

But the passage of this bill by the legislature is in itself a great triumph, and what is still more, a similar bill has, in Massachusetts, become law by the signature of Governor Ames, who has the honor which Governor Hill has refused. The workmen of Boston propose to celebrate the auspicious event. The workmen of New York can at least show how they regard the temporary defeat of the measure in this state.

The following resolutions adopted by land and labor club No. 1 of Chicago, at its last meeting on June 7, are likely to commend themselves to the sober second thought of all who had intended taking part in the proposed single tax conference in that city on the Fourth of July:

In view of the fact that the date of the single tax national conference, July 4, 1888, will be a time of great political excitement, being in the midst of the most important presidential campaign that has occurred in twenty years, when the calm judgment of the conference may possibly be interfered with by the dictates of prejudice:

And in view of the fact that the probable success of the plan upon which our friends in Texas are now working, will, at a later date, be more apparent, and that, therefore, the conference, if postponed to a proper time, will have much greater light on an important line of action, than will be possible at the date named in the call:

And in view of the fact that certain gentlemen claiming to represent the political power of the single tax movement, have, against the advice of the leaders of our reform, and against the wishes of a majority of the rank and file, held a convention and placed a candidate before the people, thereby forestalling the action of the conference, and removing from the arena of discussion the only factor whose immediate settlement is of importance:

Therefore, be it resolved, That land and labor club No. 1 of Illinois hereby requests Warren W. Bailey to postpone the date of the conference to some time subsequent to the November election.

There can be no question that the Chicago men take a wise and conservative view of the matter. Their action meets the approbation of our friends in this vicinity from whom I have heard, and will, I think, commend itself to our friends in all parts of the country.

When, in February, Mr. Samuel W. Williams of Vincennes proposed, through THE STANDARD, that Mr. Warren Worth Bailey should be authorized by the individual requests of a hundred or more single tax men to call a conference on the Fourth of July, there was much uncertainty as to the development of the political situation and much perplexity and uncertainty among our friends; and there was a general feeling that we ought

to meet together and take counsel as to what we should do. But time has made clear much that was then uncertain. The issue on which the two great parties are to join battle is now settled, and there has been among single tax men a crystallization of opinion as to what course they should pursue. The small minority who are determined on going through the forms of independent political action have met at Cincinnati and named candidates. The great majority have come to the conclusion that their part in this campaign is to support the democratic national ticket as representing the free trade side of the struggle. And some—for there are some who, though single tax men in the field of state action, are yet protectionists in the field of national action—have made up their minds to support the republican candidates.

Under these conditions there is now nothing of immediate importance or utility that such a conference could determine. It would be manifestly unwise, so long as there is the slightest difference of opinion among us, for such a gathering to formally endorse either of the old parties or to commend or condemn independent political action. The only purpose the conference could serve would be to make acquainted with each other those of our friends who might meet at Chicago and to enable them to consult as to propaganda work in the future. But, as the Chicago club intimates, there could be no worse time for such meeting and consultation than the present. Not merely shall we be able after November to see with much greater clearness what measures it would be best to take for the future, but it is hopeless to bring together in the beginning of a most exciting political campaign men whose minds are full of politics, and expect them to confine themselves, in discussion at least, to matters which have no reference to politics.

If there prevailed anywhere an impression that the gathering at Cincinnati represented the single tax sentiment and that the vote for its nominees would show our strength, then there would be some useful purpose for the conference to serve in counteracting that impression. But it is so clear that the Cincinnati action represented only a small minority—it having been repudiated even by the Chicago club, of which the Cincinnati nominee is president—that no further repudiation is needed. There is no fear of any one mistaking the failure of Mr. Cowdrey to poll a respectable vote for the weakness of the cause which his supporters assume him to represent. But such a gathering as was proposed to be held at Chicago could hardly take place without the matter being at least discussed. And "the least said, the soonest mended." It is not easy for men who have strong feelings with regard to the impending campaign to now view as dispassionately the attitude of those who differ with them, and to talk as coolly about it, as they will be able to do after November. And as whatever may be our present diversities, we should all hope to be together then, it is certainly the part of prudence to do as our Chicago friends suggest and postpone our meeting until that time. We can then certainly have a larger and more useful meeting, and may perhaps be able to make it an international conference, at least to the extent of securing the presence of some of our friends from other countries.

The Chicago land and labor club No. 1 that has adopted these resolutions is the club of which Mr. Cowdrey is president, but which has by a large majority adopted resolutions disclaiming any responsibility for putting him in the field and repudiating the Cincinnati action. In this they undoubtedly represent the general feeling of our friends in Chicago and throughout the country, and as representing the majority their opinion that the conference ought to be postponed is of more weight. It is also of more weight as coming from men resident in the place where the conference is to meet, and who could therefore attend it without the expense of time and money which would be required of those who came from a distance. Mr. Bailey, however, in calling the conference, has acted upon the written request of a considerable number of single tax men in all parts of the country. To relieve him of embarrassment it will be well for those who in the beginning authorized him to call this conference to now write withdrawing the authority. Mr. Bailey, who went into this matter at the request of others and with a view of providing a mode for harmonizing differences, has had much labor and anxiety, for which he deserves the thanks of all.

R. Frank Sylvester of Peekskill, N. Y., puts to me four questions, which I give and answer in their order:

(1) Do you advise the single tax men to support the candidates of the democratic party for congress, state offices and members of the legislature? and if not, what would you advise them to do?

I do not.

I advise them in voting for a member of congress to vote for the candidate that will go furthest for free trade, and when both candidates are protectionists, as is likely to be the case in many districts, I advise them to vote in preference for the republican, because to beat democratic protectionists will help make the democratic party a free trade party.

As to state officers and members of the legislature, I advise them to vote for those who have voted for the Australian ballot bill, or will pledge themselves to do so; and to give their support to those who come furthest our way, especially in the exemption of personal property from taxation.

Where there is a doubt, I would advise them to give the benefit of it to the republican party, for the reason that the Australian ballot bill was passed through both houses mainly by the votes of the republican members, was opposed by the majority of the democrats, and has been refused his signature by a democratic governor. I would advise our friends everywhere, between now and election, organizing for that purpose where they can, to address letters to all candidates asking their position on such measures as the ballot bill, the exemption of personal property from taxation, the separation in assessment of land and improvements, and such other measures as may lead in our direction. I would advise them, too, where they can, to push single tax men quietly to the front.

(2) Have you not said, in effect, that free trade without the "single tax" would not be a complete remedy for poverty?

I have said that free trade, as it is commonly understood, would not be a remedy for poverty; I have said this over and over again, and repeat it now. The free trade that will alone do that, is that full free trade which can only be secured by the single tax. But I regard what is commonly called free trade, or even any reduction in our protective tariff, as a step toward the single tax, and I look upon the delusion that labor can be benefited by protection as the greatest of the obstacles that prevent workingmen from doing what alone can largely and permanently benefit labor.

(3) If Grover Cleveland is re-elected president, how much nearer will we be to the attainment of the object for which we organized the united labor party at Syracuse, viz.: the single tax?

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than of our own efforts we could have been in many years. A great popular education will have taken place. The masses of men will be in much better condition to listen to us and to understand us, and a political struggle will have commenced that will continue to dominate our national politics and arouse the thought of the people. If Mr. Cleveland is re-elected, as, with courage, I believe he will be, all this will have been done, and more. Protection will have received its death blow. Timid tariff tinkers will become free traders, and an impulse will have been given to the struggle against all forms of monopoly. Whoever has read the speeches of the democratic members made in the tariff debate will see that the leading men among them without exception took radical ground against the protective principle. It only needs the prestige of success, the consciousness that free trade is the winning side, to bring the most active and influential of rising democrats to advocating the abolition of all tariffs and the resorting to direct taxation for the federal revenue. When we get to this point our work will be well nigh done.

(4) Is there any hope that in the event of democratic success at the polls next fall, the members of that party, or any considerable number of them, will favor the measures we advocate, viz.: the single tax, governmental control of railroad and telegraph lines, and the Australian system of voting?

There is. And we ought to address ourselves to the work of making it sure.

The free trade fight is the single tax fight in the national field. If we single tax men had entered the national field as an independent party, the only practical thing we could have done would have been what the democratic party is now committed to do—attack protection. For we must get rid of protection before we can get at the

revenue tariff; and we must get rid of the revenue tariff before we can get to direct national taxation; and we must get to direct national taxation before we can get to the point of imposing that taxation on land values. And we must make a break in the line of linked monopolies before we get at the railway monopoly and the telegraph monopoly and our wasteful and absurd monetary and financial system. The issue in this national campaign between free trade and protection is the issue between the interests of the masses and the interests of those who grow rich by taxing them. If monopoly is beaten at this one vital point, the result will show such strength of anti-monopoly feeling that the fight against monopoly will begin all along the line.

Even so far as the tariff discussion has already gone, it has shown a strong tendency to bring out the real democratic feeling in the democratic ranks. The effect of the campaign in this direction must be still greater—it must be to bring to the front democrats who understand the democratic philosophy and to imbue that party with more of the ideas of Thomas Jefferson than it has known for years. I also expect much from the republicans. Their speakers and papers will do great good by putting protection doctrines in the most ultra form, and by compelling the democrats to make some effort to show what is the real reason why wages are higher in the United States than in Europe. Further than this the republicans, in defense of the tariff, will be obliged to attack the internal revenue system, which in itself is as repugnant to our principles as is the tariff system.

But the great mass of the people are only nominally either democrats or republicans. It is on this great mass that I expect the campaign to tell most strongly and most hopefully. For the first time in more than a generation they will hear a large economic question discussed, and be compelled to think upon it. This will dispose them to think, and will lead them to think, upon all economic questions. That is what we want. As I said in every speech I made in the last campaign, what we are most concerned about is, not how people vote, but how they think. The great obstacle we have had in our way has been the indisposition to think upon economic questions.

It must be remembered that while we have a dual government we are but one people; and that the men who vote in a presidential election are also the men who vote in state elections. A great presidential election—and this is certain to be the most intense and exciting that we have had for many years—is the most powerful means of popular education, because the discussion goes on over the whole Union at the same time and arouses more interest than all the state elections put together. But the work of education that is thus done will tell afterward in the state elections. After this campaign, and especially if protection is defeated, we will find the people of all the states more alive to measures of real reform than they ever have been before.

Another question may arise out of what I have said. Why, it may be asked, if I think the internal revenue system as much opposed to the principle of the single tax as the tariff system, do I side with democrats against the tariff rather than with republicans against the internal revenue?

Because the tariff is far more important. Because it is supported by a theory which justifies taxation for the sake of taxation, which inevitably corrupts government, and blinds the people to the real causes and true remedies of the evils they feel—a theory that must be overthrown before we can hope for real reform. The internal revenue system, on the other hand, has no excuse but that of raising revenue, and the monopolies which it fosters stand comparatively alone. The internal revenue system is, so to speak, an isolated fortress. The protective tariff is the key of the enemy's position.

Here is a model campaign platform. It is the platform of the Cleveland free trade club, reported by L. A. Russell and unanimously adopted. If the democracy in New York and throughout the country will make their fight on these lines they will surely win:

We hold that universal freedom of trade is a natural right.

A protective tax falls unequally. It has a purpose apart from useful revenue and it is unjust, unjust and not warranted by the constitution.

A tariff, delusively called protective, raises the profits of the home producer and such increased profits come solely from the home consumer, who is thereby shut out from the benefit of free competition.

An import duty on goods operates as an export tax on the goods and agricultural products given in exchange.

We denounce a system which compels us

to surrender the trade in manufactured goods with the 1,500,000,000 of the people on the earth to the nations of Europe in order to enable a few protected monopolies to extort double prices for their products from 60,000,000 of American taxpayers.

A protective tariff in our country has been productive of a long list of evils. It has tended to centralize and unify, not to diversify national industries. It has raised prices and thereby limited the ability of the common people to get and enjoy the necessities of life. It has affected unequal and unjust distribution of the fruits of labor. It has made the few very rich at the expense of the many. It has crushed small fortunes and industries, multiplied millionaires and created trusts. It has bred strikes and discontent among the people and encouraged speculation and waste. It has corrupted legislatures and fed a corrupt lobby to the general demoralization and discouragement of the people. It has lowered wages and diminished their purchasing power. It has made business unstable and employment irregular, subjected both to dread of congressional action, and taught the people to distrust and fear their representatives. It has inflicted its grossest wrong upon agricultural industry, an industry in which almost one-half of the people are employed. It has destroyed the finest merchant marine the world has seen, and made our flag a stranger to the open seas.

We approve the American system of interstate free trade and insist upon its application by the United States in their relations to the world.

With a firm and patriotic faith in the justice and wisdom of free trade, we associate together and invite to co-operate with us all who want no special privileges themselves or are unwilling to labor that a favored few may be protected.

President Cleveland can be re-elected, and re-elected triumphantly, if he will face the situation boldly and continue to show the same courage of his convictions that was exhibited in his message and has been shown in his attitude up to this time. But this is indispensable. It will be fatal to him to let his friends, or pretended friends, put the party which he leads in any equivocal attitude. And of this there is some appearance of danger—at least, here in New York, which in this election, as in the last, is likely to be the pivotal state.

The democratic machine in New York—owing necessarily to the elective system, a bill for the amendment of which Governor Hill has just vetoed—is rotten to the core. It has no devotion to principle and no enthusiasm for principle. Nor has it any friendship for Mr. Cleveland, although seeing that he was demanded by the great mass of the party in terms that would admit of no denial, it formally supported his nomination. It contains among its "bosses" many men whose greatest desire it is to "knife him." This they can do most effectually, under a pretense of conservatism, by decrying and disclaiming the position which the president and his party have taken before the country, and by which they must now stand or fall. It was one of the bosses of the county democracy, himself a protected manufacturer, mistakenly placed on the committee on resolutions at St. Louis, who gave Henry Watterson a good deal of the trouble he had in securing a platform up to the standard of the nominee's attitude. And the ratification meeting held by Tammany hall on Tuesday night, at which Governor Hill declared he would not have been present had the platform favored free trade, was another of many indications that the local leaders of the democratic machine intend to enter the presidential canvass making apologies for, and explanations of, their party's policy instead of boldly supporting it as sound and just.

That this policy meets the enthusiastic support of the *Sun*, whose dearest wish is to defeat Mr. Cleveland, is sufficient evidence of what it means, and what it is intended to accomplish. It is vitally important that President Cleveland, the members of his cabinet who are really in accord with him, and his sincere well wishers here, should understand clearly that any such policy of cowardly evasion and treachery will cause the democratic party to lose the electoral vote of the state of New York.

If the party in New York begins to run at the very opening of the campaign, the retreat will turn into a stampede under the onslaught which the republicans are certain to make, in all probability under the lead of their strongest man—Mr. Blaine. A campaign of explanation and apology is sure to end as the Hancock campaign ended. Mr. Cleveland has burned his ships; he stands before the country as the champion of free trade against protection, and he must make, as he has ample power to do, the weak and treacherous politicians of New York and other doubtful states accept that position or go into opposition. Else, in spite of the splendid courage he has heretofore shown, they will involve him in the fate that in affairs of great moment befalls the timid.

It is utterly hopeless to attempt to gain votes by evasion. In the president's own phrase, he is facing "a situation, not a theory." We now have a tariff with protection as its object and revenue as its

incident. If the protective theory is right, congress ought to solve the surplus difficulty either by making duties still higher, and therefore less productive, or else by abolishing the internal revenue taxes on whisky and tobacco. Instead of advising either of these courses, the president in his message recommended that the duties on imports should be reduced, and he supported this proposition with a free trade argument. The democrats in congress have, with substantial unanimity, given their support to a tariff bill that, in the main, follows the lines thus laid down, and their speeches have rung with denunciations of the whole protective theory; while the convention at St. Louis has declared the president's message to be the proper interpretation of the otherwise ambiguous tariff plank of 1894. This, then, is the situation that the democratic party must face.

The democratic leaders may rest assured of one thing, and that is that they cannot blind anybody else by shutting their own eyes to this situation. Above all they cannot fool workingmen. Republican papers and speakers can be depended on to prevent the success of any such attempt. If protection is a good thing for labor then the reduction of protective duties is a bad thing for labor. If protection keeps up wages, then the democratic party has attempted to deliver a blow at wage workers, and it must expect the wage workers to hit back. Let there be no mistake about the strength of the protective delusion among workingmen. Even among the members of the once united labor party of New York who freely confess that the levying of all taxes on land values, to which they are committed, must necessarily lead to absolute free trade, there are many who still fear to make the first plunge in tariff reduction, and who if not convinced that a tariff does not even temporarily assist in maintaining wages, will vote to perpetuate the war tariff. These men are perhaps not very wise, but they are not fools; and they certainly will not under existing circumstances turn to the democratic party to preserve that tariff. All concerned may as well accept it as certain that this year the believers in protection are going to vote for the party that proposes to give them protection, to give them plenty of it, and to give it continuously. If there are democrats who honestly imagine that they are going to catch any considerable "labor" vote by pretending that they are just as good protectionists as the republicans, and only want to cut down unnecessary protection, they will, by next November, find their mistake.

There is but one road to success for the democratic party in this canvass and that is the courageous and straightforward one. If Mr. Cleveland wishes to remain four more years in the White house let him again advise his friends to "tell the truth," and clearly repudiate those who would put him in an equivocal position. The democratic party is not the friend of the protective policy. It never has been, and it has by word and deed, and most convincingly by the enthusiasm with which its masses have rallied to the support of Mr. Cleveland, confessed this within the past year. It has declared itself as opposed to protection because protection taxes the whole people to give to a favored few the advantages of monopoly. In assuming this position the democratic party really entitles itself to the support of the workingmen, and it ought to let them so and show them the fallacy of protectionist claims. The wage earners of the United States are more ready to be convinced of the utter humbug of protection than ever before. Had it not been for the cowardice of democratic leaders in the past the great body of workmen would long ere this have been supporting the democratic party because it is a party opposed to a high tariff. Even in the protected industries it is already apparent to workmen that a tariff which brings large profits to their bosses gives no assurance of high wages to the employees. The last remaining bugaboo before which they tremble is the fear that tariff reduction may bring to an end the particular industry in which they are employed, and thus cause them to be thrown out of work until they can find other employment. Our country's experience under the revenue tariff of 1846 demonstrated how groundless is this fear. And it will be easy for capable writers and speakers to show how the expansion of trade and industry that will be brought about by a reduction of duties will make the demand for labor keener and more continuous than it has been for many years.

American workingmen have been deluded into a belief in the protective theory as much by democratic cowardice as by the interested advocacy of the protected monopolists. It is now "good politics," even if nothing else, to put an end to this ruinous policy. Let the democratic party now set about showing workingmen that protection does not protect them, or cease to expect their votes. The way to win is to silence apologists; send skulkers and cowards to the rear, and face the music.

HENRY GEORGE.

QUERIES AND ANSWERS.

Hard Times and Machinery.

PHILADELPHIA, Pa.—As the consideration of "hard times" interests the laborer, mechanic, merchant, manufacturer, and capitalist, I wish to give you a few thoughts upon the subject.

The question is often asked, "What is the cause of our hard times?" This has various answers. One says "it is the result of the contraction of the currency." This cannot be since all industries suffer from hard times when there has been neither expansion nor contraction of the currency, in England, France, and Germany, in fact, all over the civilized world; besides there is more money now in the country per capita than there was during flush times. Another answer is, "we are too extravagant, we must economize." A long editorial was published in one of our city dailies a few weeks ago urging upon its readers the duty of every one to economize. Will this bear analyzing?

Suppose we have been in the habit of wearing two silk hats and one Panama each, but now we have concluded to economize and wear one of a cheaper kind; you see at once we hurt the hat trade. Suppose instead of buying two pairs of boots one year we make one pair do us two years, and again, we make one suit of clothes last as long as three did in good times. Do we not injure the shoe and clothing manufacturers and dealers? Economy, as practised, would break up half the merchants of the country. If we economize we must stop buying books, music, paintings, and every thing that makes our homes beautiful, we must sell our pianos and carriages, and then we hurt the dealers in all of these luxuries. No, the demand is not for greater economy; it would bankrupt the country.

In my opinion we are using too much "labor saving machinery." We make a combination of wood and iron—and that is what a machine is—the work of brain and muscle. Brain and muscle must suffer.

It is all very nice to grow eloquent over the wonderful achievements of the human intellect; to enlarge on the splendid mechanical inventions of man; but what is the result? That man is out of work; he is a tramp. Not the dogs, but the machines, are after him. He is driven from one occupation to another by the little machines. Perhaps when he was a young man he spent the necessary number of years to learn shoe making. After a while along comes a genius, a fellow who, by his wits, who has invented a machine that will make as many shoes in one hour as he can make in a week—well, what can Mr. Shoemaker do? He has to learn some other trade; perhaps cabinet making; he masters that after a few years (as it does not take a Yankee long to learn a trade); so he goes to work at cabinet making; soon another genius comes along and sells the boss a machine that will do his work many times cheaper. Mr. Cabinet Maker is discharged, and the machine takes his place. He would not permit a Chinaman to do this without a protest, but being a machine, it is all right; he packs up his "kit" and goes. He is driven from one city to another, and finally takes to the road and becomes a tramp.

If 200,000 Chinamen were to land here tomorrow and were to go to work for fifty cents a day, how long do you suppose it would take to raise an army of laborers, mechanics, and merchants, too, sufficient to drive the Chinamen into the river? Now, we allow these machines to work every day for less than fifty cents and we never open our mouths about it. Again, Chinamen would consume something. Society would make them dress and nature would make them eat; machines do neither. They never buy a hat, coat or pair of boots, never want meat, potatoes or anything else that man must have, and yet one machine often does the work of twenty and perhaps fifty men.

Now, if we could discard enough machinery to absorb the surplus labor we could give the mechanic a chance for his life. If the argument that to cheapen the things we must have to administer to our wants is a blessing, then the Chinaman must be a blessing. They will work for twenty-five cents a day and they are almost as handy as a mechanic. If we had plenty of Chinamen laborers employed the mercantile trade would be good, and as the manufacturer depends upon the merchant, of course his business would be good also.

It benefits no one to be able to manufacture goods cheaply. We are all in the same boat. If I am a manufacturer of shoes and can get my shoes made cheaper than any one else, of course I have an advantage, but that is not the case. If I can get my shoes made for six cents a pair it does me no good; other manufacturers can do the same. I have no market for them after they are made. I had better pay twenty-five cents or even a dollar a pair, make fewer and find a market for all I can make and at a profit.

We must have our railroad, steamboat and other improvements of a kindred nature. They are not labor saving to a great extent, except they save the labor of horses, and men will not raise horses unless it pays. But men do have families and they must have something to do, for the fact has gone forth: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." We can't get around it. We have been trying and our country is in a sorry state—only our country, but all other civilized countries are in the same condition. In the hope of solving this problem, many say "we must open new markets." Our merchants and manufacturers are considerably exercised about the Brazilian trade. What would the Brazilians be likely to buy of us? For about fifty miles back from the coast, they will want some jewelry and a few crucifixes; in the interior, a shot gun and a jug of whisky. These are the luxuries and necessities desired by North American Indians, we must ship our goods to England, France and Germany. If we do that, will we not injure our brother laborers there? We wouldn't like them to treat us in that way, and the golden rule, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you do even so unto them," like the other, must be obeyed.

The prosperity of this nation does not depend upon the millionaires, because they are in the minority, but upon the millions, and the millions are idle; men and women buy when they have money; they have no money because they have no work. They have no work because all over the land we hear the rattle of machinery. The skillful combinations of iron and wood are doing their work for them. Do they eat and drink, or dress? They consume no bread, but their rattle drowns the cry of hungry children, the rush of shuttles stifles the wail of their shivering mother, and the thud of their hearts of steam is louder than the complainings of afflicted humanity.

There must be a revolution. I hope it may be a peaceable one, but if we persist in the use of "labor saving machinery" as we have for the last twenty-five years the whirlwind must come, and "woe unto him by whom the offense cometh."

W. C. STRICKLER.

If you are not a protectionist, you have all the symptoms, except figures. Your reference to the interests of the "laborer, merchant, mechanic manufacturer and capitalist" is paralleled by the advertisement of the quack doctor who cured "sickness, consumption, smallpox, measles and diphtheria." Are not mer-

chants, mechanics and manufacturers laborers? And how many merchants or manufacturers do you know who are not capitalists? Before attempting an inquiry into the causes of "hard times," it would be well for you to get a rational idea of the factors and the distinguishing characteristics of the factors, the relations of which you must consider.

You are quite right in questioning the miser theory of hard times. Hard times are not to be cured by economizing. If one man economizes when others do not, he may relieve his hard times; but when all economize, all must experience harder and harder times. Last summer a young man, while traveling in the interior of this state, fell into discussion with a commercial traveler on the subject of abolishing poverty.

"Well," said the commercial traveler, "I believe that the way to abolish poverty is to save—to be economical; the more economical men are the more certainly will poverty be abolished."

"You are a drummer, are you not?" inquired the young man.

"Yes," said the commercial traveler, "I am a drummer for a dry goods house."

"Well now," the young man again inquired, "if everybody should be as economical as possible, how long would you be on the road?"

The commercial traveler hesitated, combed his hair with his fingers, stared at the floor, and with a "give-it-up" grin responded: "Sure enough! I wouldn't be on the road a week!"

The economical doctrine had lost an advocate.

Of course economy is not a remedy for hard times. Trading is essential to prosperity, and the more active the trading the greater the prosperity. If men did not buy they could not sell. That is the reason that protection is a bad thing. It forces people to economize more than they want to. The farmer buys one hat when he wants two, or a poor hat when he wants a good one; and that helps to make hard times for hatters. Hatters in their turn suffering from hard times buy a pound of flour when they want two; and that makes hard times for the farmer. And so it goes, until every one complains of hard times, and denies himself to relieve them, when what is really needed is that every one shall be free to buy whatever he wants in exchange for whatever he can make.

But after giving your common sense full swing in showing the absurdity of this theory, you fall a victim to the fallacy of fallacies that underlies the doctrine of protection. We make a machine do the work of brain and muscle, you say, and therefore brain and muscle must suffer. How could you write such stuff and not see its absurdity. You might as well have said that electricity carries our messages, and therefore our legs must suffer. If brain and muscle suffer because their drudgery is done by machinery, brain might find relief in libraries and muscle in ball matches. We are not compelled to do without exercise because machines work for us. You may ride in a drawing room car to Albany, but if your legs are shriveled for want of exercise there is nothing to prevent your walking to Albany. What you have in mind when you say that brain and muscle must suffer because machinery does their work, is that a great many people are able to live only as a few others give them opportunity to work for a living, and that these few give less work to men when machines will do the same work cheaper. There is a truth in this, the pith of which you ignore. The evil is not in machinery which relieves us of labor, but in the use of machinery under a system that makes some men dependent upon others for the right to work; and the true remedy is not to restrict the use of machinery, but to remove restrictions from opportunities to work.

That the tramp is a result of the introduction of machinery is true; but machinery is only a secondary and innocent cause. So long as any man wants anything which labor can produce, there is work to do; and so long as standing room on the earth remains there is natural opportunity for work. If, therefore, machinery causes idleness, it is not because it does all the work that is needed, but all that the forestallers of mother earth will permit.

You are wrong in supposing that men cannot readily shift from one employment to another. Between one extreme and another of diversified employment there is, indeed, a gulf which few workmen can cross and which none can cross without great effort and expenditure of time; but between one employment and a great number of employments nearly related to it, there is so little difference that any intelligent man can readily adapt himself to a change. Hence, to introduce machinery into any of these employments, even though the machine does all the work, is not naturally to deprive workmen in that employment of work; it is to invite them into other fields of industry to which they are quite as well adapted, and where in consequence of the machinery that has relieved them of the work they once did, they can get with less labor more of the comforts of life than they got before. This is the natural result. But since greater power of production consequent on the introduction of machinery makes greater demands for land which is privately owned, the value of land rises, so that on the one hand the machine does not produce as cheaply as it otherwise would, and on the other the workman finds it more difficult to get access to land, without which he cannot work at all. Machinery is to a mechanic what a vacation is to the man who works by the day; in itself desirable, but dreaded because it closes the only source of income open to him.

A machine that will make as many shoes in an hour as a shoemaker can make in a week should be a good thing for the shoemaker, just as a washing machine is a good thing for the farmer's wife; the reason it is not is because when the shoemaker turns to the vast fields of employment that invite his labor, he finds the fields fenced off into narrow lanes with a toll gate at the head of each lane and a new and higher schedule of tolls at every gate.

If machines were the evil things you

think them, why discard only enough to absorb surplus labor? If surplus labor were absorbed merely, that would only keep wages where they were for a time; increase of population would soon make a new surplus of labor. Why not discard all machinery at once and prohibit its introduction again?

You are mistaken in saying that it benefits no one to manufacture goods cheaply. It benefits every one. You are thinking of money when you speak of cheapness. Cheapness in money really makes no difference in the long run to any one; but cheapness in labor expenditure does. To get the most with the least labor is the natural and legitimate desire of all; and when production and exchange are unfettered every device by which anything can be produced with less labor than before is a good thing for everybody. It tends to diminish the labor of everybody, and if it does not do so in fact, the fault is not with the improvement, but with laws that operate to make laborers pay for the right to produce and idlers to live in luxury on the labor of their fellows. One of these laws is the protective tariff, which taxes the multitude for the special benefit of a few; another, and the chief devil of its kind, is the institution of private property in land, under which planet owners levy tribute on planet users for the right to work here, to breathe here, to be here.

The flat, "in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread," has indeed gone forth. But never, save from mortal lips, has yet gone forth the flat, "in the sweat of thy face shalt thy brother eat bread!" Yet it is under this human gospel of plunder, and not the decree you quote, that we are living. The man who sets out to obey the command of his maker to eat bread in the sweat of his face finds all the avenues to work which his maker provided, closed by force of human law. If he would eat bread in the sweat of his face he must agree to share it with a loafer, not only before eating it, but before he will be permitted to make it. And naturally enough, when the loafer discovers a machine that will make bread without sweating or eating, he has no use for the man who is willing to sweat provided he may eat.

Mr. Shearman's Speech.

BOSTON.—(1) Is the Standard oil monopoly due to the tariff?

(2) In Thomas Shearman's article in THE STANDARD of the 19th on the tariff, it is stated that the surplus in the treasury induced excessive speculation in land which brought about the panic of 1857. In what manner does a surplus in the treasury operate to do this?

(3) In another part of the same article he states that the average production of each English workman in the metal and textile industries for the year 1850 was \$79, and the value of the American workman in the same industries was \$1,684. Were these values English or American? Ought they not to have been calculated either in American or English values to make a fair comparison, as the same amount of production in England would have a great deal higher value in the United States owing to the tariff?

E. LUCAS.

(1) The Standard oil monopoly is due mainly to private control and manipulation of transportation facilities—to interference with freedom of trade. Public highways are essential to trade, and if they are obstructed in the interest of individuals or corporations, monopolies result. In a similar way, when free intercourse between nations is obstructed by a tariff, monopolies result. The same principle operates in each case, though one monopoly may be due to one form of protection and another to another form.

(2) The manner in which excessive speculation in land operates to cause a panic is explained in Chapter I, Book V, of "Progress and Poverty." Mr. Shearman explains the way in which a national treasury surplus induces excessive speculation in land, which was largely induced by the surplus in the treasury at that time. The panic of 1857 was also brought about by speculation in land; but the treasury surplus was not by any means so important an element at that time as it was in 1857. In 1857 the last of the United States debt was paid off, and, in consequence of the maintenance of an exorbitant tariff, a surplus which was greater relatively for that period in our national history than the present surplus rapidly accumulated. This money was distributed by the government among the state banks, with urgent directions to lend it out freely and make money easy and business active. But as our natural development of industry was checked by the obstruction of the tariff, and as this money was forced out of natural channels in order to be lent to those men who had most influence with banks, it inevitably followed that the banks fell into the hands of speculators, who borrowed the money for speculative purposes. In this manner the amount of money which the banks would have to lend for such purposes was suddenly doubled. As a matter of course, there being in those days very few railways, and speculation in railway stocks being insignificant and confined to three or four eastern cities, there were, practically, only two channels for speculation, land and cotton. The cotton speculation naturally ran into and encouraged the land speculation. The banks, being under political management, lent their money under political influence, and pressed loans upon politicians all over the United States. There are fifty men who are disposed to speculate in land for one who will speculate in anything else on a large scale. When this amount of money, which was vast, considering the smallness of our population and the limited experience which our people had had in the use of money, was forced upon speculators in every part of the country, nine-tenths of the borrowers naturally began to buy land. Land rose rapidly in price; and, the more it rose the greater was the number and enthusiasm of the speculators. This brought about the crash of 1857. But notwithstanding that disaster, the government still had a large surplus; and congress forced it among the people by distributing it among the states, most of which wasted it, scattering it either in loans upon land or in digging canals which never paid for a quarter of their cost. The result of this was a revival of speculation in 1858 and 1859, ending with

another crash in December, 1859. Both of these panics were directly traceable to the treasury surplus.

So, at the present time, the enormous treasury surplus must either be blocked up in government vaults or be loaned out to the banks. Some time ago it was locked up; and then we were driven to the verge of a financial crash, because it was evident that within a few weeks the government would lock up nearly all the floating gold of the country, unless its policy was changed. Accordingly, financiers implored the government to save them from ruin; and in order to do this, the government deposited its surplus freely with the banks, requiring them, however, to repay it on call. The banks have therefore many millions of government money, which, since they must repay it on call, they can only lend on call. But loans on call are invariably made to speculators, as no one else will borrow money in that way. The consequence is that the treasury surplus is now lent out to speculators, in order to enable them to keep up prices. The result of this process must inevitably be further speculation, ending in a crash, the losses of which the common people must pay. If the surplus were not thus lent to speculators, it would have to be locked up; and then, the country being deprived of its floating gold, not merely all speculation, but all enterprise, would feel the effect as one of strangulation, and the crash would come at once. Meanwhile, any one who reads the daily papers, especially the western papers, can see that a wild land speculation has been going on in the west; and this happens now, as it happened in 1836, 1856 and 1872, simultaneously with the piling up of a surplus in the treasury.

In 1857 the government locked up its surplus and only let out that which it spent in the gradual increase of extravagance. But as it became more extravagant it excited speculation, which, of course, ran into land, as it always does when it becomes general, and then, when the first sign of trouble among speculators occurred, the government locked its money tightly up, and so the panic came almost like lightning, just as it would do now, if the government should do the same thing. Before the middle of 1859 the government surplus had all been paid out, but not paid to speculators, while the tariff, being reduced, no further surplus accrued; in fact, the government complained of being poor, but that meant that the people were growing rich. The consequence was that business revived very rapidly, and 1859 was the most prosperous year which had ever, up to that time, been known in American history.

(3) Mr. Shearman, of course, calculated values in England and America respectively, according to the value of the articles produced in the country of production; and this is the only fair method of comparison. Seven hundred and eighty dollars was the value of the English workman's product to the English employers; while \$1,684 was the value of the American workman's product to the American employer; showing that, although the American employer got 120 per cent more value from his workman than the English employer, he paid less than 45 per cent more wages to get it. Mr. Lucas must remember that, according to the unanimous testimony of the protectionist advocates in congress, metals and textiles cost no more to the consumer in this country than they do in England. Of course, there is not a word of truth in this; but that is what the protectionists all say. If it is true, then the American employer makes an enormous profit off the American workman in excess of that which the English employer makes. But if it is not true, still this is the only fair basis of comparison; because the same Americans who produce metals and textiles have to use them; and if the articles which they have to buy cost them 120 per cent more than the same goods cost the English workman, it is very clear that they gain no advantage by getting only 45 per cent higher wages than the Englishman. But even if we were to allow for the utmost difference in price which any one will claim, this will not be more than 40 per cent, and therefore, adding 40 per cent to the price of the English product would bring it up to \$1,092 against the American workman's \$1,684. This shows that the production of American workmen averages more than 50 per cent in excess of the production of English workmen, quite irrespective of the price; that is to say, for each yard of cloth or ton of metals which the English workman produces, the American workman produces in the same time more than a yard and a half, or a ton and a half.

But we repeat that the fictitious value added to the American product by the tariff ought not to be noticed for the purpose of comparison, since that fictitious value goes into the pockets of the employer and is paid out of the pockets of the workman. It would, indeed, be a fine plea for protection to boast that workmen were paid fifty per cent more wages and then compelled to pay one hundred per cent more for everything in which they spend their wages.

LOUIS F. POST.

AUGUSTA, Ga., June 4, 1888.

MR. HENRY GEORGE.—Dear Sir: In a recent discussion upon you and your books, A contended that you were: First and foremost a free trader; second, for a single tax; third, in favor of making it a tax on land. B on the contrary contended that your convictions followed a reverse order. First, that you thought justice, expediency and morality demanded that land should sustain the burden of taxation; second, that you favored this single tax; third, that you were for free trade as a means to the above end.

HENRY B. KING.

In point of time I was a free trader before I saw the necessity of appropriating land values in order to secure natural rights and the economic beauty of thus securing public revenues. But I never have been in favor of a tax on land, and did not come to the idea of taxing land values through the idea of imposing but one tax.

Neither A nor B have stated my present views as I would state them; but of the two B more clearly represents the relative importance the propositions have in my mind.

HENRY GEORGE.

THE BOULANGER BOOM AND ITS CAUSES.

Emile de Laveleye in *Le Petit Journal*.

The sudden and violent movement in favor of General Boulanger seems at first sight wholly inexplicable. He whom they desire to place at the head of the republic has done nothing worthy of so high an honor. He has gained no victories; he has not shone in parliament as war minister; he is not a distinguished general; he represents no special principle. As has been often said, he is a concert ball hero and a circus general. His popularity is the result of a stupid duty and his black horse. He has against him all true friends of the republic and of liberty, all socialists and enlightened people—in fact, all true patriots who would blush to see France delivered into the hands of a dictator created by street singers. And yet this is not quite impossible. The danger is a real one, for at the head of the government himself signalled it.

Let us examine what are the causes which render possible, if not probable, what appears monstrous to a degree. The primary cause of all is the manner in which the parliamentary system works in France. The chamber of deputies has become an arena in which rival parties quarrel and fight, sacrificing only too often the interests of their country to their own spite or ambition, different groups modifying their schemes, joining with others and separating again at a moment's notice; two of these groups, the radicals and the monarchists, uniting to overthrow successively every cabinet formed, and these of course powerless to satisfy the various hostile to each other and in reality demanding impossibilities; hence a ceaselessly unstable government and twenty cabinets in eighteen years. It is a complete chaos, or, to use a vulgar but very appropriate term, "a thorough mess." Such a sight disgusts the nation with the whole parliamentary system. In this General Boulanger is right. If he should sweep off the chamber of deputies the people would not complain of it. It is a noticeable fact that as soon as the session closes and the deputies disperse, there is a general sentiment of deliverance. During the vacations the nation is quiet; men can attend peacefully to their business; but no sooner does the house meet than the discussions, questionings and upsets of all kinds recommence. Parliamentarism in France has become a nuisance of which all are wearied. Hence the desire for change.

The situation is very similar to that which preceded the 18th Brumaire. Napoleon himself admirably describes this situation as follows: "When deplorable weakness and incessant versatility become manifest in the governing body of any state, when, yielding in turn to the influence of rival parties, and going on from day to day with no fixed programme, no definite aim in view, it has given proof of its insufficiency, so that even the most moderate citizens must find admit that the state is no longer governed; when, also, the administration joins to its nothingness within, that greatest of all evils in the eyes of a self-respecting people, degradation without a vague feeling of uneasiness seems to permeate all classes of society. The instinct of self-preservation is awakened in its midst, and men look around and among themselves in search of a man who can save them from what they are in fear of." There is, however, this great difference between the present state of things and that above referred to; that France is not in a humiliating position as regards foreign countries, and that, as deliverers, Boulanger and Bonaparte can not well be compared.

The second reason of the movement is that the people believe that the fall of the empire and the establishment of republic and free institutions would bring about an era of prosperity; and this was so during the first few years after 1870; industry and commerce developed very considerably for a time, but then came the universal economic crisis, and the general fall in prices, which, in France, as elsewhere, occasioned real suffering and want. This evil is not attributed to monetary contraction, which the majority of French economists deny, but to a lack of some kind in existing institutions; hence the wish to modify them and try something fresh.

The third cause is that the French, as a nation, have a strong tendency to attach themselves rather to an individual than to a principle. They want the hero to stir up their imagination, and the power of the idol becomes irresistible if he wears a sword and has gained some battles. The founders of the third republic foresaw this danger and provided against it when they enacted that the president of the republic should not be elected by universal suffrage, but by the two chambers.

In an article published in the *Fortnightly Review* in December, 1879, entitled, "The Future of France," I wrote as follows:

By universal suffrage France has placed the decision of her destinies in the hands of masses who are completely incapable of discerning their true interest, and will less what is demanded for the safety and prosperity of the country, carried away by the mad and legendary, the worst malady that can taint a nation. Universal suffrage has thrice, with genuine enthusiasm, placed absolute power in the hands of the hero of Boulogne, and obeying the prefects has invariably elected men who were profoundly mediocre but wholly devoted to personal power. Everywhere and always despotism has been the natural fruit of ignorance. Now that the blind multitudes will no longer be able to vote for the man of Sedan, we have to fear that they will choose the most extreme representatives of the opposite opinions—socialists, legitimists, ultramontanes, phrenic conservatives—who by the desperate violence of their struggles will make men long for order, even at the price of liberty.

Universal education must precede universal suffrage. The great danger of the Boulanger movement is that it is supported, not only by all that is most ignorant among the masses of the people, but also by the aristocracy, the reactionists, legitimists, legitimists, legitimists, and also by the clergy. The latter wish the monarchy, even at the cost of civil war and the most fearful upsets. They consider that the Red sea must be passed to reach the promised land. This is very perilous policy, for it must not be forgotten that the slams of Paris are peopled by a dangerous populace of over one hundred thousand, comprising on the one hand anarchists and nihilists, and on the other vagabonds and brigands, who, if once the civil authority wavered for only a few days, would unscrupulously set fire to the city far more systematically and completely than in 1870.

What means can then be employed to prevent France falling under the dictatorship of an adventurer far more discredited than Louis Napoleon? In the first place, the *scrutin uninominal* should be established instead of the *scrutin de liste*, by which all the deputies in a department are elected by the same vote; otherwise, by placing Boulanger at the head of the lists, a great many partisans of the dictatorship might pass, being supported by the mass and the reactionists. Secondly, the radicals in the house must cease their alliance with the monarchists for the purpose of upsetting each succeeding ministry; and, finally, it would be well to adopt the American system of ministers who have no seat in parliament and are not dependent on a vote. This stipulation is a further proof, if such were needed, of the admirable foresight of the

American constitution. It does away with all the miseries of the parliamentary system.

Is it probable that the republic will after all become definitely established in France? It must at all events be hoped so, for a monarchy would not long be maintained. It would be perforce despotic, and as such would provoke vehement resistance; the only safety in foreign warfare. Still it cannot be denied that the strengthening of republican institutions presents great difficulties in a Roman Catholic country, where three irreconcilable parties battle for power at the risk of compromising the most serious interests of the state.

How is it that Catholicism is here an obstacle of freedom? First, the pope, henceforth infallible, condemns as a heresy and a plague freedom of worship, freedom of the press, and the whole existing organization of society. These the defend the system of 1789 and threaten to overthrow it, and to carry a war defensive but unrelenting. As it is impossible to attack the clergy without touching religion, the religious sentiment is violently shocked. As this sentiment is still the only basis of morality, that in turn is lowered and relaxed. Relaxation of morals has invariably led to enfeeblement of character. Now, without morals and without character liberty is impossible. "A state divided against itself cannot stand," say the scriptures; how specially true is when the division concerns the very foundation of moral life.

Secondly, consider that the clergy, having in their hands the women, the children, and the peasants, thus dispose of a force that is enormous, incalculable. It must, therefore, be extremely difficult to found on a solid base any regime which the Roman church attacks with all the forces at its command. If the republic in France lasts we shall see renewed with more violence than ever that ancient struggle between the principles of the revolution and those of the Catholic church, which has already been the cause of so many disasters and cost so much blood. This struggle seems to be henceforth without an issue, now that the pope has declared "that the two principles are as irreconcilable as good and evil, darkness and light." France being no more prepared to renounce Catholicism than the modern principles, it is impossible to foresee all the difficulties which will grow out of this conflict. I will mention only one. Nearly all republicans in France are anxious for the separation of the church and state in the United States, and this is even an article of the programme of the present ministry; but if this separation were decreed it would raise such strong opposition that the republic would in all probability succumb. How escape from this syllogistic circle, where the danger on all sides is equally great?

It is thus quite certain that there are many obstacles in the way of the strengthening of the republic, but still, with prudence and wisdom, these may be overcome or avoided. Probably the Boulanger movement will be but of short duration, but the parliamentary system requires modification.

PEN, PASTE AND SCISSORS.

A well known London firm of refreshment contractors recently advertised for 4,000 additional waiters, and 10,000 applications were received in response to the call, and the candidates claiming to have had experience.

According to the *Electrical Review*, medicine may be introduced into the human system by electricity. The electrodes of a battery are saturated with medicine and applied locally to the skin. Experiments show that there is a gradual absorption of the medicine into the system.

A new telephone line nearly eight hundred miles long from Marseilles to Paris is now in course of construction, and will soon be finished. At first, it was feared that the human voice could not be transmitted such a distance; but experiments have shown that, with a thick, low-impedance wire, the sound can be sent eight hundred miles as easily as ten.

One of the most noticeable characteristics of the Mohammedans is the fact of their temperance. They abhor a drunkard, and it is only about once in a year that a drunken man is seen upon the streets of Alexandria; and though the peculiar facilities for travel in Egypt have brought many thousands, over ninety-five per cent are kept by Europeans.

The authorities of Vienna, the most musical city of Europe, have decided to banish the organ grinders. A decree has just been issued by the imperial government, banishing all grinders of organs, with their instruments, from the streets. In the future the hale and strong organ grinders will be treated as vagrants, while those who are crippled or otherwise afflicted will be relegated to the almshouse.

The largest umbrella in the world has been made in Glasgow for the king of East Africa. It can be opened and shut in the usual way, and when open is twenty-one feet in diameter, and the staff is also twenty-one feet long. It is lined with cardinal red and white, has a lot of straw for the ribs, and is of crimson satin. The canopy itself is made of Italian straw, and the top terminates in a gilded cone.

The vanilla bean is the costliest bean on earth. It flourishes in Mexico, chiefly in Papantla and Misantla. It grows wild, and is gathered and marketed by the natives. Just as the commodity of the forest is sold at \$10 or \$12 per thousand. After the beans are dried and cured they are worth from \$7 to \$12 per pound, according to quality. Last year the vicinity of Papantla alone exported sixty million beans. They are used by druggists and confectioners, and are an important article of commerce.

A few days ago a small sealed package came to the Hiram, Ohio, postoffice addressed to a young lady and stamped at the New York custom house, where all foreign mail must be examined, "supposed liable to custom duty." The package was opened by the postmaster to notify a custom house officer to come from Cleveland in order that the package might be opened in his presence and examined by him and the proper duty assessed. The package was found to contain to half of his traveling expenses; but it did not, for it contained simply a letter and a small slice of wedding cake, the value of which could not well be assessed.

Russia has so much petroleum that she does not know what to do with it. Our exports to that country have increased in ten years 100,000,000 gallons. What we do send is refined not the crude oil. Russia is ahead of any country in inventions and devices for using the oil. Over 12,000,000 gallons of oil refuse are burned as fuel on the railways and steamships there every year. Oil lamps are brought to a high state of perfection, and in parts of St. Petersburg oil is employed for street lighting instead of gas. Despite this heavy consumption and the exports, however, millions of gallons are burnt in the Baku district each winter merely to get rid of it.

A Mr. Groezinger will shortly proceed to Europe for the purpose of endeavoring to establish factories there for making wine from material forwarded from California. He proposes to press the juice from the grapes here and dry the solid part in a large dryer. The juice will be condensed and forwarded with the dried solid part, which is called the pomace, and on arrival at its destination, water can be added and fermentation proceeded with. He believes that he can find a market for all the pomace that can be supplied from his section of the Napa valley, and that a good marketable wine can be made at low cost. If successful this will provide another outlet for the vineyard products of California, besides the wine. France the deficiency of European vineyards.

THE STANDARD.

HENRY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.

Published weekly at
25 UNION SQUARE, NEW YORK CITY.TERMS, POSTAGE FREE.
One year, \$2.50; six months, \$1.50; single copies, 5 cents.
Entered at the postoffice, New York, as second class matter.

Communications and contributions are invited, and will be attentively considered. Manuscripts not found suitable for publication will be returned if sufficient stamps are sent for return postage. No notice will be taken of anonymous communications.

Contributions and letters on editorial matters should be addressed to THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD, and all communications on business to the PUBLISHER OF THE STANDARD.

THE STANDARD wants an agent to secure subscribers in every part of the United States, to whom liberal terms will be given.

THE STANDARD is for sale by newsdealers throughout the United States. Persons who are unable to obtain it will confer a favor on the publisher by notifying him promptly.

Sample copies sent free on application.

SATURDAY, JUNE 16, 1888.

THE STANDARD is forwarded to subscribers by the early morning mails each Thursday. Subscribers who do not receive the paper promptly will confer a favor by communicating with the publisher.

THE LAW OF LABOR STRIKES.

There is now pending before the court of appeals of this state and soon to be decided, a case which will settle the law of labor strikes. It is a habeas corpus proceeding in behalf of John E. Gill against Police Justice Smith and Warden Walsh.

In September, 1886, Gardner & Estes, a shoe manufacturing firm, employed a new foreman—one Hart. Hart, it appears, had the reputation in the trade of a "scab" foreman, that is, a foreman who is expert in breaking up shop organizations. As Gardner & Estes' shop was a union shop, considerable anxiety was felt by the employees over the employment of Hart, and they remonstrated with the firm. The head of the firm assured them of his good intentions, and begged them to give Hart a fair trial. At the firm's request the employees laid the question of Hart's employment on the table for a month, to see whether or not he would try to interfere with the organization, and at the end of that time, the foreman having done nothing inimical to the organization, the matter was laid over two months longer.

Before the expiration of the latter period, and in the absence of the firm, Hart discharged one of the most active union men in the shop, one who had been employed there for four years, and was recognized as an excellent workman. When asked why he had discharged this man, Hart replied that it was because he had detected him in stealing. The employees then demanded of Hart that he either reinstate the discharged workman or prosecute him for stealing. The workman was reinstated.

A few weeks later, on the return of Mr. Gardner, the same man was again discharged on the same accusation. The employees sent a committee to Mr. Gardner to know the reason, and on receiving his reply, proposed an arbitration between a committee of the Knights of Labor and a committee of the employers' union. To this Mr. Gardner acceded.

Before the Knights of Labor committee, of which Mr. Gill was chairman, arrived, Hart, the foreman, discharged every one in the shop; and when the committee came they were informed by the employees of this "lockout" and instructed that under no circumstances would the employees now return to work unless Hart was discharged.

At the meeting between the Knights of Labor committee and the employer's committee Mr. Gill and his associates stated as a condition of settlement that the foreman must be discharged, and when asked whether in case of his discharge the foreman could get work elsewhere, replied that no union man within fifty miles of New York could work with him on pain of expulsion. Accordingly Hart was discharged and Gardner & Estes took back their former employees.

Thereupon Hart preferred a complaint against Mr. Gill and the other members of the committee and they were arrested. Police Justice Smith held them, after a hearing, on the charge of conspiring to injure trade, and by means of threats and intimidation to prevent Hart from working. On habeas corpus proceedings before Judge Barrett the police magistrate was sustained, Judge Barrett writing an opinion, in which he held that such combinations of workmen were criminal. On appeal to the general term of the supreme court Judge Barrett's decision was affirmed, and from the general term the case has now gone to the court of appeals.

This is the first time that the question of labor strikes has come before our highest court. In 1812 it was held in the mayor's court of this city that a combination of workmen to refuse to work with men who worked for less than schedule wages were indictable; a similar decision was rendered in the general sessions in 1823; and in 1835 the old supreme court decided to the same effect. These are the only cases of the kind in this state, except very recent ones, none of which have been appealed.

In the present case all elements of violence and of any form of coercion except the negative form involved in an agreement not to work are eliminated, and the court of appeals must broadly determine whether that form of coercion is unlawful. If it decides that it is, labor strikes will be outlawed. It is true that the penal code expressly permits peaceable strikes to raise or maintain wages; but this permission, should the court of appeals decide against Gill, will insure only to the benefit

of strikes having that object directly in view. Thus, if a shoe manufacturer reduces or refuses to raise the wages of his employees, they may strike; but if the employees in other shops or in other trades strike to assist them, the latter strikers may be indicted. So, if an employer refuses to employ or discharge union men, and his men strike on that account, they may be indicted. It will be readily seen, therefore, that the decision of this case involves substantially the lawfulness of all labor strikes.

The case is one of the most important that has ever come before the court of appeals, and the decision will be awaited with interest. Should it be adverse to Gill, trades unions in this state will find themselves almost powerless until the legislature modifies the present statute.

THE TARIFF DEBATE.

The five minutes debate begins to drag, owing to the fact that the dilatory tactics of the republicans cause much irrelevant discussion. It took two more days to dispose of the paragraph putting lumber on the free list, and the debate took a wide range. During its continuance the democrats pinned several of the republican members down to the admission that protection did not secure any higher wages to men engaged in the lumber industries than are paid to men in the same region engaged in unprotected industries. Mr. Anderson, a republican from Iowa, took strong ground in favor of free lumber, and declared his purpose to support the Mills bill, since the republicans had failed to bring in any bill reducing the revenue, as they were bound to do by their platform.

One of the amusing incidents of the discussion was the persistence of Mr. Funston (republican) of Kansas in avoiding a direct answer to the question whether or not he was in favor of maintaining a duty on lumber. The republican legislature of Kansas has requested the members of the house from that state to vote for free lumber, and Mr. Funston's colleagues have in consequence voted with the democrats on that clause in the pending bill. Mr. Funston, however, managed in the course of a speech to declare that he was in favor of protecting every industry carried on in this country, and that he would therefore vote against putting lumber on the free list. The persistence with which he was questioned on the subject indicates an expectation that he will be called to a sharp account by his constituents for thus voting to continue an onerous tax on the people of the prairie states for the benefit of the millionaire owners of lumber lands in the northwest. The incident also afforded a new evidence of the growing restiveness of the western republicans under the burdens imposed upon them by a policy forced upon their party by its eastern members.

The debate on lumber was finally brought to an end, however, and the clauses reported by the committee on ways and means were adopted without amendment. Then came the clause putting salt on the free list, which gave another occasion for a whole day's debate. In the course of the discussion Mr. Cox made one of his usual witty speeches, and he was rudely interrupted by the notorious Mr. Belden, who represents the salt interests of Onondaga. Mr. Cox made fun of the salt representative and laughingly tried to make him apologize for a misstatement, but Belden was surly and neglected the opportunity to show himself capable of decency in debate.

The interesting incident in the salt discussion was a speech by Mr. Whiting of Michigan, a salt manufacturer representing a salt district, who made a sound argument for free salt, and declared his entire readiness to compete with England and all the world in the business. He declared that he made better salt than that imported, but admitted that there were in Michigan many dairymen who preferred the imported salt and used it, and such being the case he disclaimed any desire that the government of the United States should undertake to compel them to use his salt. Such a speech, coming from a salt manufacturer, produced something of a sensation in the house. The amendments of the republicans to the free salt clause were lost by a vote of 46 yeas to 86 noes, and the clause was accepted.

All of Saturday's session was devoted to the clauses putting flax and tow on the free list, and the same arguments about the effect of the tariff on wages were repeated. In fact, the relation of protection to labor has been the main subject of dispute, the democrats insisting that labor derives no benefit from it and the republicans exaggerating the differences in wages between this country and England, and claiming that to the tariff alone must we look for an explanation of the alleged high wages in this country. Both sides manifestly see that this must be the line of debate when the question comes before the country, and this clear perception of the real issue is likely to defeat the efforts of time serving trimmers to prevent any discussion of the merits of protection by democratic speakers on the stump.

LIMITATION OF FORTUNES.

The Boston Globe sensibly says in discussing overgrown fortunes and propositions to arbitrarily limit them by law, that "when our laws are made to say that a man cannot make just as much money as he possibly can, provided he makes it honestly," and "when affairs have come to such a crisis that the government takes the liberty of inspecting a private citizen's account books and reducing his business within certain prescribed limits, then democracy will have passed beyond the experimental era and will have demonstrated

itself a flat failure." To all of which THE STANDARD says, "Amen!"

But it must not be forgotten that there is, or at least ought to be, vast significance in that adverb "honestly." A man should be allowed "to make just as much money as he possibly can, provided he can make it honestly." If that means anything, it means that laws must not be made—if made, must not be permitted to stand—which enable any one to make money by getting what other people earn.

When protective tariffs compel consumers to pay more for what they use than it is worth in open market, the beneficiaries of such tariffs do not make their money honestly. When railway franchises enable their owners to charge producers "all the traffic will bear" for transporting products, the beneficiaries of those franchises do not make their money honestly. When slave laws protect masters in appropriating the earnings of their slaves, the masters do not make their money honestly. When land laws force wages down by putting premiums on the natural opportunities of labor, the beneficiaries of cheapened labor do not make their money honestly. When landlords grow rich by taking part of the produce of labor as a price for permitting labor to be done, the landlords do not make their money honestly.

This is no indictment of individuals; it is an indictment of laws. Individuals who profit by such laws are simply doing what society invites them to do, and society has no right to complain. But such laws should be abolished, and every man left to make, in the language of the *Globe*, "just as much money as he possibly can, provided he makes it honestly."

The *Press* institutes a comparison between Belgium and Ireland, and therefrom deduces a moral. Belgium, it tells us, "is a shining example of national and industrial independence," while Ireland is "the Cinderella of the nations."

Belgium has her native government; her brave and chivalrous militia; her glorious universities; her manufacturing districts teeming with population; her well fed, comfortable, intelligent peasantry; her granaries fairly bursting with the weight and wealth of agriculture.

Ireland, on the other hand, sits weeping in the widowhood of provincialism, the eternal shame of England. Her patient peasants labor on her fertile soil and reap the grain and tend the flocks, garnering and shearing for the stranger, and crawling into their cabins to live in a condition of permanent want.

And the reason of it all, according to the *Press*, is that Ireland is cursed with British free trade, while Belgium sits under the vine and fig tree of protection. Evidently the *Press* writer has never been to Belgium, and doesn't know that next to England Belgium comes nearer to free trade than any country in Europe. But let that pass. There is one distinctive feature about the Belgian political system that the *Press* ignores. Out of 6,000,000 of inhabitants, only 117,000 have votes. According to the *post hoc ergo propter hoc* style of argument of the *Press*, the example of Belgium teaches that the way to secure the prosperity of a nation is to disfranchise its people.

The New York *Economist* seems to be very much muddled about the question of free wool, no unusual thing by the way for an economist of the protection persuasion. With a horrified air it warns the country that "the city is full of foreign wool dealers to-day watching the operations of congress and the passage of the Mills bill, and in such an event they are prepared to fill all orders and supply the American mills with a twelve months' stock at ten cents a pound less on unwashed wools, twenty cents on washed, and thirty cents on scoured wools, and fifty cents a pound on worsted combed tops." This is supposed to be disheartening news. But why, it is difficult to see. If American mills can get their raw material so much cheaper, they can and must sell their products cheaper; selling cheaper they will sell more; and needing more workmen they will promote a tendency to higher wages. There is no necessity for shedding bitter tears over such a state of affairs.

The *Economist* appears to have suspected that its cheap foreign wool scare was not exactly adapted to the labor department of the protection school of political economy; so it treats one Mr. E. S. Higgins as a man who "stands ready to close the largest mill in America the remainder of the year if wool is admitted free." Mr. Higgins must contemplate an engagement with Barnum, as a mercantile "freak," if he seriously proposes to close his mill because he can get cheaper raw material. It would be intensely painful to have Mr. Higgins carry out his threat, but if he really "won't play," somebody else will, and we take pleasure in assuring these "foreign wool dealers" who are "watching the operations of congress and the passage of the Mills bill," that the American wool market will not close when Mr. Higgins takes his vacation.

Having thus tried to alarm mill owners by predicting lower prices of their raw material, and held up Mr. Higgins as the awful example who will not work up wool unless he has to pay from ten to fifty cents a pound more than it is worth, the *Economist* gravely assures its readers as "the fact of the matter" that "we have free wool now," and "have had it for two years." If that is true, what are those idiotic "foreign wool dealers" filling the city for, and why are they "watching the operations of congress and the passage of the Mills bill?" Why do they not cable for the wool which they want to sell so

cheap? And what is Mr. Higgins waiting for? Why does he merely stand "ready to close the largest mill in America the remainder of the year if wool is admitted free?" Why does he not close it now, since "we have free wool?" Barnum's season has already begun; he need not wait on that account.

This is a sample of the kind of argument that is served by protection advocates. In one brief paragraph we are asked to infer that cheap raw material will prevent its use in manufacturing; told that the largest manufacturer will close his mill if his raw material is made free of duty, and reminded that that very raw material is already free and has been for two years. Mark Twain used to tell of a unique character who made himself invincible in argument by the simple process of inventing his facts. Twain's character must have been the original protectionist.

Speaking of the democratic platform, the *Press* says: "We now have a free trade platform. If the people want free trade they will elect Cleveland and Thurman next November. If not, they will elect the republican candidates." This is not exactly true. We are sorry to say that the platform is not a free trade platform. It is an anti protective platform, and that is about as near to free trade as can be expected of a political platform in these early days of the great struggle upon which we are entering. It is a step, and a long and decisive one, in the direction of free trade. If that is what our Sax-eclipsing contemporary means there is no reason to find fault with its statement. The platform is in truth a challenge to the republicans to fight the protection issue; and any democrat who pretends to be a protectionist might as well pack up his traps and go over to his friends now as later in the contest. The latter part of the *Press's* observation is quite true. If the people—that is, a majority of the people—want free trade they will elect Cleveland and Thurman, and if not they will elect the republican candidates; and whether the democratic or the republican ticket be elected, this is certain, that the popular vote for Cleveland and Thurman will be the free trade vote of the country.

A Card from Father Huntington.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD.—Your editorial article last week assumes that the Rev. Dr. De Costa is expressing the opinion of "an association composed largely of clergymen" in his manifesto against the Charity organization society. Will you allow me to state that I do not know of any other member of the church association for the advancement of the interests of labor who is with him in that attack, however we may agree with him in some of the main principles he lays down. I should like also to assure you, though the assurance seems hardly necessary, that several of the clergy associated with Dr. De Costa in that society are by no means blind to the fact that the monopolization of land is the cause of a large amount of poverty, and its consequent evil "class charity." However rapid may be the progress of our cause in the opening up to all of the natural sources of wealth, there will be, for one or two generations at least, a residuum of poverty, ignorance, imbecility and vice, in dealing with which some agency similar to that of the Charity organization society will be a constant necessity.

May I tax your patience a little farther to enter a protest against the occasional unfair attack upon the "Episcopal" church which finds place in your columns. The last slur cast upon us is for praying for our friends who cross the ocean that they may be "guarded from the dangers of the sea, from sickness, from the violence of enemies, and from every evil to which they may be exposed." We had thought that this was at least as "harmless a prayer as could be offered," and certainly did not suppose that we were impairing the efficiency of the transatlantic steamship lines by repeating it. But your writer neglects to note that we do consider it necessary to pray for railroad travelers, and while the prayer from which he quotes is an occasional prayer which need never be said, we are required three times a week to repeat the petition, "That it may please Thee to preserve all who travel by land or by water," in which the one service is regarded as quite as much in need of God's care as the other. Perhaps if we said our prayers with more faith they might be as effectual in leading officials to a deeper sense of responsibility as are caustic articles in newspapers. Always sincerely yours,

JAMES O. S. HUNTINGTON, Sup. O. H. C.

The Way the Truth is Marching On.

LAND AND LABOR CLUB NO. 9, CLEVELAND, Ohio.—For a sample of missionary work would state that two weeks ago we had a very warm discussion with a prominent socialist on the question "whether or not the same system of competition would not prevail under the single tax; and if so, what right have George men to claim they have solved the labor problem." This same socialist at our last meeting handed in his name for membership in our club, stating that he agreed with us on the land question, and the only reason he opposed us before was that he knew nothing about it. This is a fair sample of the way in which the "truth is marching on."

Shall We Drown Them?

Electric Age.
We learn from western correspondents that the "tramp" element of the craft is making its way to many of the managers of the larger telegraph offices, who hire them, perhaps, in ignorance of their previous record, or because they need the assistance of even a "tramp" telegrapher for the time being. The "tramp" has managed to eke out a living in the beginning under the fostering care of penurious managements, because he would work cheap, and after he has become unmanageable he has been furnished with a pass and transported to many of the managers of the telegraph offices, who hire them, perhaps, in ignorance of their previous record, or because they need the assistance of even a "tramp" telegrapher for the time being. This is the man the reliable, steady element of the craft has to compete with in some offices. What to do with the army of telegraphic tramps is a burning question to some managers. For the welfare and future of the profession, the tramps should be ignored altogether.

ST. LOUIS SIDEWALKS.

St. Louis Landlords Assert an Ownership of Them and Collect Rent for Their Use in Defiance of Law.

St. Louis, June 4.—The often heard cry is: "Oh, the people are not being imposed on very much; if they were they wouldn't tolerate it." This is a stock argument of the conservatives. Let them consider the way St. Louis people are robbed of sidewalk privileges if they want to change their minds.

If there is anything about which people are thought to be jealous, it is the sidewalk; and yet to-day there are land owners who are deriving a snug sum every year for the use of the public sidewalks. In St. Louis, as in every large city, there are hundreds of fruit stands, book stalls, etc., occupying portions of the sidewalk, and I have yet to hear of a single one paying a cent to the city. I inquired about this and was told that the house owner had the right to the use of a certain number of inches of the sidewalk. I then went to City Controller Campbell, who said: "These stalls have no right to occupy the public sidewalk." But I ventured to suggest that the people could not have tolerated this imposition all these years, especially since the sidewalks are only narrow at the best. Possibly the land owners or store owners had a right to the sidewalk? To this Mr. Campbell replied: "The building owners have no right to use the sidewalk for the purpose of exacting rent. That was not the intent or purpose of the law, giving them the use of so many inches. The practice has simply grown up in St. Louis unopposed, and that is all the basis there is to it. I do not think another large city in the country allows such renting."

I investigated still further and found that one fruit stall man on Broadway, near Pine street, pays an annual rental equal to \$600. Another, near Sixth and Olive streets, pays \$25 a month for his privilege. He showed the receipt for his last payment. It was signed by a well known firm of real estate dealers. The last mentioned stall is on one of the busiest corners in St. Louis, and where the travel is the thickest and the sidewalk the narrowest. Figuring at a rough guess, there are a thousand of these sidewalk "selling places," and a policeman told me that that number was not too large; and placing the annual rent of each at \$50, we have \$50,000 a year that goes into the pockets of private persons for the use of public ground.

Yea, verily, it is hard to impose on the great American public!

As I stood thinking of this, I said to a police officer: "It's a shame, isn't it?"

"Oh, I don't know," he replied, "it don't affect me."

"Doesn't? Why, all you have been asking for is \$50,000 to give the needed increase in the police force. How about this \$50,000 that is going to waste?"

And then he scratched his head and admitted it seriously affected him.

CITIZEN.

The Modern Miracle Worker.

PATERSON, N. J.—The most peculiar feature of the movement for industrial freedom by breaking down the artificial barriers between work and workers, is the crop of single tax men who want the tariff taxes retained. How they can reconcile tariff taxes on almost all the products of labor with a single tax upon land values only is one of those conundrums which—like the Lady or the Tiger, the Man in the Iron Mask and who satisfy Billy Patterson—must go without any satisfactory reply. It must be that, ignoring all natural laws, they have come to believe that two bodies can occupy the same space at the same time, and therefore that there can be a single tax only and at the same time taxes on some 4,000 labor products.

Yet when one considers that the blessed tariff has converted this country from a howling wilderness into a smiling garden, it is asking a great deal to require people to forget what they owe to it. The difference between then and now—the fact that in the howling wilderness there was a chance for every one to dig out a living, and that the smiling garden is pretty well fenced in and protected by high walls of tariff laws, with broken bottles on top, and Pinkerton game marauding around—don't matter much. We who stand outside the wall can enjoy the garden by reading the society column in the newspaper.

Since the wilderness has become a garden, and the garden is fenced in, when the owners want to allow a few men in to work in it, and there are more men waiting at the gates than the owners have use for, the wages of those who do get in can be kept up by adding a few inches to the height of the fence or breaking a few more bottles; but that could not be done without having the fence to begin with.

Of course the fact that when three men work and there is but work enough for two, wages will be low, don't operate in this garden; the fence changes all that. Were it not for the fence, the only way that wages could be kept up would be to have the owners of the garden need more men than were waiting for a job.

In fact, the fence is even more powerful to work miracles than any saint's relics ever were; like charity, it "blesses him who gives and him who receives," and if he who gives is satisfied to give, why, let him give and presently call the watch together and thank God for the modern miracle worker—the tariff.

E. W. NELLS.

The Question of Taxing Mortgages.

MEMPHIS, Tenn.—I have read your answers to the letter in which I sought to point out the inexpediency and injustice of treating the mortgagee as a joint owner and of taxing him accordingly, and they do not appear to be very satisfactory and by no means to go to the bottom of the matter.

You say that "the man who lends money on the security of vacant land, standing timber, or a mining privilege, stands on precisely the same equitable footing as the man who buys vacant land, standing timber, or a mining privilege;" but you make no effort to show this to be so. If you mean to say that the people, being the real owners of the thing pledged, may deprive the mortgagee of his security at any time, you are right, but that is quite a different matter. You will observe that there must be a debt before there can be a mortgage, and that to tax the debt because it is secured by a mortgage is to tax merely because of one of its incidents—discontinuing against it and in favor of all non-secured debts. If this is done under the supposition that all money loaned on unproved properties is really purchase money it is wide of the mark, and if it were not it still would be unjust. If I have sold land and taken a mortgage for the purchase money I am certainly entitled to full payment, principal and interest (if the land after the single tax has begun is still worth so much), before the purchaser receives anything. If your tax on existing mortgages means anything it means that this purchaser and myself are to show the depreciation incident to the adoption of the single tax.

Is this right? I have searched the works of Mr. Henry George in vain for any justification for such a proceeding.

When the slaves were freed, those holding liens on them, whether for purchase money

or otherwise, lost their chattel security, but retained their debt as before, to be enforced against other property of the debtor; and it would seem that this should be the plan to be followed whenever the single tax is adopted. I cannot see that the "equitable footing," as you call it, of a creditor, is altered because he has landed security in addition to personal. Exactly what end you have in mind in advocating this tax on existing land mortgages, I do not know, but I am unable to see any good result that can come from it. If the debt is due, or nearly due, such a tax will either hasten its foreclosure or its renewal at an advanced rate that will pay the tax and not the mortgagee the same interest as before. If the debt is not due, the tax will constitute a pure confiscation of a portion of the interest for the sole benefit of the debtor! A proposal to admit evidence as to the use the money loaned had been put to would be unworthy of any lawyer or statesman, for it would put a premium on fraud and perjury on the debtor's part; while the taxing of all existing land mortgages without regard to what use was made of the money loaned would be even more unjust, if possible.

When Mr. Post gets off on his pet schemes of exempting homesteads and taxing mortgages, I can hardly recognize the clear and forcible exponent of the single tax in its unclouded brilliancy, and I hope he will abandon these strange idols or give us some reason for the faith that is within him.

Very respectfully,

BOLTON SMITH.

PLAIN FREE TRADE TALK.

Hot Shot Against Protection at a Democratic Mass Meeting in Brooklyn.

An illustration of the way in which free trade doctrine comes to the front whenever a few men engage in tariff talk, was to be seen at a mass meeting held last Monday evening by the Seventeenth ward Cleveland club of Brooklyn, to ratify the nominations made at St. Louis. The meeting was a very large one, all the representative men of the party in the district being present. The first speaker, United States Marshal Stafford, declared that the democratic party did not advocate free trade, and that it was dishonest in any one to say to the contrary. The party had for its aim democratic protection—protection against trusts and monopolies.

Martin D. Wilbur, however, who was the next speaker, thought differently. He started out with the declaration that he himself was a free trader, and he talked along in this fashion: "The tariff question is the real issue of the campaign. The campaign is to be a campaign of reason and facts against old prejudices. He could not understand how Irishmen, driven out of their country by the tyranny of landlordism, could in this country cast their ballots in the interest of great monopolies and a landlord class just as tyrannical and grinding as those in the old country. Senator Frye had stated before a New England audience that were the tariff on hatches removed that industry would be destroyed. How, then, was it that these New England hatches were being sold in London markets? How could the abolition of the tariff hurt this industry? The same condition of things was to be found all through the protected industries.

"American workmen have nothing to fear from the extinction of the tariff. They, with their superior intelligence, coupled with their skill and superior inventive genius, could, were the barriers to free exchange thrown down, command the markets of the world. As it is, for one man benefited by the tariff sixteen men have to suffer. He said that the labor required to manufacture a five-pound blanket costs thirty-three cents, but that the tariff on blankets amounted to \$1.98. He asserted that, taking all things into consideration, in the industries most highly protected by the tariff the lowest wages prevailed, and he instanced the iron, steel, glass and coal industries. Reversely, he said, wages are highest in unprotected industries.

The speech, bristling throughout with facts and terse arguments, told on the audience, who cheered enthusiastically, and when the speaker sat down he was roundly applauded.

Progress and Poverty Class.

After a recess of several months the Progress and Poverty class met last Monday evening at No. 392 Bowery. Arrangements have been made to hold regular meetings on the first Monday of each month at this place. On July 2, at 8 p. m., W. J. Gorschuch will deliver an address on the subject "Is the tariff a side issue?" Members of the class and friends are invited to be present and may look for a lively debate.

SOCIETY NOTES.

Three little waifs were picked up on Friday night and were taken yesterday to Randall's island.—(New York Sun.)

Competition for employment has now driven women to make walking advertisements of themselves. They have not fallen quite to the level of the sandwich men, but let time alone for that. At present young, comely and shapely women are fitted out by leading milliners and dressmakers establishments in the newest and most pronounced costumes and sent out to promenade in Broadway and Fifth Avenue. It is said that the girls selected are those who have been for several years used in their employers' stores as sales, but which to show off goods, and thus have become so well known to wealthy customers that on being seen in the streets, they are instantly recognized. The freshest wares offered for sale are announced under the most favorable circumstances.

It might almost be said that there has been an epidemic of suicides of late. The causes leading to them have been of a varied character, and while in some cases prolonged dissipation led up to the tragedies, in others the motive appeared to have been a fear on the part of the suicide that he could not support either himself or his family.—(Philadelphia Record.)

William Link of Brooklyn applied to the charities department a few days ago to have the county physicians inquire into the sanity of his wife, who lives in an old hotel building on the old Johnson road beyond Bushwick avenue. The physicians, after a brief examination, found that Mr. Link was sane, but that the treatment she had been receiving from her husband was such as to warrant the belief that her head might be turned at any moment. The family was found in abject poverty, without proper food or clothing. The condition of the children was such as to warrant an investigation by the Society for the prevention of cruelty to children.

A report reached a church at Georgetown, Ind., during services, that gold had been discovered in the neighborhood, and that nuggets worth \$4 or \$5 apiece were being found on the surface, where every person left the church in the midst of the sacred exercises and began to search for worldly wealth, leaving the minister utterly alone with his God.

Chicago contains a class of houses and people that represent the lowest condition that can exist in a civilized country. It is a condition scarcely above the brute creation. In fact, it is worse than that, for as much as it has none of the natural advantages the brutes possess—pure air, pure water, and sunshine—that are free to them, but impossible to the humans who inhabit a certain class of tenements.—(Milwaukee Review.)

MEN AND THINGS.

A sudden, though unfortunately a very brief glare of light has been thrown upon the public school system of New York, by the recent investigation into Superintendent Jasper's character and fitness for his position. The illumination has been brief, because Mr. Jasper's "vindication" has been prompt, and with the official endorsement of his methods by the board of education, the curtain naturally descends. Enough has been revealed, however, to furnish very serious food for thought. Two things have been made evident: that the public school system of New York is grievously inadequate to the needs of the city's population, and that the methods of instruction are such as to tend to store the children's memories with a blind knowledge of accepted facts, without giving them any training worth speaking of in the art of using their minds and increasing their stock of knowledge by observation and reasoning. In the higher schools and classes there appears to be ample room for all who seek instruction; but the lower grades are over crowded to a degree that renders anything like efficient teaching an impossibility. And the method of determining the merit of teachers and scholars by the number of book questions that the pupils can be brought to answer by rote is necessarily prejudicial to education in the true sense of the word.

Why does the state educate her children? Not out of charity or kindness. Were such the reason, it would be difficult to say why public clothing stores and public kitchens, where all who would might be freely clothed and fed, should not be established alongside the public schools. It is in order that they may become good citizens, that the state may escape the awful danger of breeding up a generation of ignorant, irresponsible voters, in whose hands the ballot might prove a frightful weapon of destruction.

Now the first and most essential quality of good citizenship is the ability to think—to sift and weigh evidence and argument—to foresee consequences, to detect fallacies, to know the right thing from the wrong thing, the just from the unjust. In a democracy founded on equal suffrage each man is, to the extent of his own vote, a sovereign, and a sovereign whose power is despotic. And just as an infinitude of separate fibers, each one so feeble that an infant's strength can break it, can be twisted into a giant hawser that shall suffice to pull down a steely post so may a sufficient number of individual votes be combined into one gigantic power that shall outdo in sheer despotism the czarism of all the Russias.

And this is true, in these times of ours, as in the history of the world it never was before. There are men now living, who within the limits of their recollection have seen greater changes in the factors of civilization—in the methods of wealth production and exchange—than occurred in any five hundred years, of which we have any record, before the opening of the nineteenth century. Compare the slow discovery and settlement of the new world with the rushing development of the force of steam—the tardy, cautious growth of old time commerce with the rapid exchanges and organizations made possible by electricity—the building up of territorial kingdoms with the mushroom-like up-springing of commercial monopolies. With the tremendous mastery mankind has so suddenly obtained over the forces of nature social problems are presenting themselves which, rightly or wrongly, must be solved at once. For good or evil, the men of to-day must decide in what way they will use the genius they have summoned. That the genius will prove profitable servants, or untamed destructive influences, according as we decide to use them, none will deny. Only, how are we going to use them? That is the question fronting us, and which must be answered by the men and women trained and training in our public schools.

Now, in the mere memorizing of rules of arithmetic, and of facts in geography and history, what is there to fit a human being for the study of the great problem of the day—the question of securing to labor its full opportunity and its full reward? What to our school children is the source of knowledge? Not examination and discovery—not weighing of evidence and careful judgment—but blind acceptance of authority. The book says so, or the teacher says so, or somebody says so who is supposed to know. It is not by methods such as this that men are taught to claim their rights as freemen, and to maintain them unimpaired.

And the pity of it is that we pursue this system, not in ignorance, but out of mere indolence. We know better. The science of education is no mystery. We could train our children to use their minds if we only would. But it is less trouble to find out what book questions a pupil can answer than what he really knows. And so we grade our teachers efficient or incapable according as they turn out a greater or less number of pupils who can give set answers to set questions, and send out into the world year after year fresh thousands of young men and women who are made to believe that they have received "a good common school education," when in reality we have given them nothing that can properly be defined as an education of any kind.

The Star, alone among the London dailies, recognizes the true cause of the evil, and points out that it is of little use to try to check the growth of poverty in London while land values are left to be appropriated by private individuals. Meantime the people who live by other people's labor are busily urging, and to some extent applying, their pet panacea. Technical education is the latest of these. If only the poor wretches in the slums of London can be transformed into skilled work people there will be no more trouble. And actually they have had a meeting at the lord mayor's residence to take steps for raising £150,000 to found a great school of technology. It never seems to occur to these good people that the demand for skilled labor is vastly more limited than

that for unskilled. If every wretched sewing woman in London were a skilled telegrapher or typewriter, what could they possibly do save to drag down the wages of telegraphers and typewriters without raising those of sewing women?

The English house of lords committee continues its investigation into the ways and methods of the "sweaters." Not a little indignation has been aroused over evidence showing that such aristocratic labor employers as Poole and Redfern have been on the whole as willing to avail themselves of the services of sweaters as the more humble dealers in slop clothing. The two great tailoring houses will be made to bear a certain amount of odium which they ought justly to escape, since it is no tyranny of theirs, but the great social crime of land monopoly that has wrought the evil. But the introduction of their names has had one distinctly good result. It has effectually disposed of the claim that the sweating system flourishes because employers can't afford to pay high wages. No protective tariff that ever was devised could maintain prices at an abnormal level so effectually as is done by the decrees of fashion that certain things shall be bought at certain places and nowhere else. If employers paid high wages simply because they realized large profits, the people who work for Poole and Redfern would have little cause of complaint.

As might be expected, the evils of the sweating system are as rampant in Paris as in London. Indeed, it is probable that they are greater in the French capital; the trained economy of the people enabling the standard of subsistence to sink to a far lower point of cost, and thus distributing misery among a greater number of people. The Parisian municipality has taken up the question, and adopted a series of ordinances which they think will diminish the evil. Hereafter, whoever contracts to perform any work for the municipality must do so subject to the following regulations:

The employment of sub-contractors, task-masters, or sweaters (marchandises) is formally forbidden.

The workmen employed for the works of the town must be working directly for the concessionists or contractors, and not for any intermediary.

The normal duration of a day's work shall not exceed nine hours of effective work, and there shall be one day's rest per week.

Another regulation provides that the wages paid by contractors shall never fall below a certain minimum, which is a little above the rate paid by ordinary private employers. Where overtime is unavoidable there is stipulated an increase of twenty-five per cent for day work and double pay for night work.

All this is only doing, in a different way, and to a less degree, what the Bourbon kings did when they artificially cheapened the price of bread in Paris—selling it there for less than cost. The roads swarmed with people from other towns, making their way toward the favored city, where bread was cheap. The new ordinances recognize the possibility of an effect of this kind, for one clause provides that no contractor shall be permitted to employ more than one foreigner for every ten persons in his service.

The United States maintains an expensive academy at Annapolis, in Maryland, besides a small fleet of training ships and a force of officers and seamen, all for the purpose of giving a number of young gentlemen a costly and very complete education, not only free of charge, but absolutely free of all expenses whatever. It would be an exaggeration, perhaps, to say that the United States navy is maintained at a terrific cost for the sole purpose of providing for these young gentlemen after graduation from the naval academy; but it is unquestionable that that is at least one, and by no means the least important, of the functions of the navy. Every graduate is entitled to enter the service if there is a vacancy for him; and if no vacancy exists, he gets a year's pay and an honorable discharge, and is left to make his own way in the world, with the advantage of an education such as few young men can command.

Surely all this is liberal enough. So liberal, indeed, that it is hard to find grounds on which it can be defended. The best that can be said for it is that it secures to the government, though at a terrible expense, the services of a specially expert set of men, who have given evidence of their fitness by passing a searching examination before graduation.

But now comes the news from Washington that at the examinations held this month at Annapolis, thirteen out of a graduating class of twenty-three were found deficient in their knowledge of steam engineering and therefore could not pass. Upon which, by instruction from somebody in authority, the requirements were modified, a new examination held, and the thirteen, passing triumphantly, were gratified with a year's pay each and honorably discharged. Between jobbery of this kind and dispensing with the examination altogether is only a difference of degree.

There is a prospect of a fresh set of fishery complications—this time with the government of Denmark. A thoughtless providence has made the coast of Greenland a great resort for halibut, and the fishermen of Gloucester have found it out and are going there to catch them. This displeases the Danish owners of Greenland, who look upon the halibut as their property, and they have consequently issued a circular of warning, notifying their intention to seize and confiscate any fishing vessel found in those parts.

The Rev. Lyman Abbott, in his new pulpit at Plymouth church last Sunday, took up his testimony against the present industrial system, which he looks upon as the fruitful parent of social ills, and which apparently he expects to see swept away, or at all events seriously modified, by some special act of providence. "In the name of Christ," said Dr. Abbott, "I demand of the social system that it shall not be perfected by the accomplishments of competition, but that every man who wants work

shall be able to get it, and that he shall be permitted to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow."

Yes; but how? There are just two things needed to secure a man work—first, a place to work in or on, and second, material to work with. Given those, and no man need be idle. Every either one of them, or let private individuals monopolize the supply of either one, so that they can either charge blackmail for the use of it, or forbid its use on any terms, and straightway it becomes inevitable that the man who wants work should not be able to get it save by virtue of that very competition that Dr. Abbott wishes to see swept away.

It is a pity that men like Dr. Abbott should strain their eyes with gazing toward the distant mountain peaks, looking for a special deliverance to come from the mysterious beyond, when right before their very feet lies the path that leads to safety if they would but see it and take it.

The speeches and reports made at the annual congress of British and Irish co-operative societies show that the advocates of this form of industrial organization are beginning to appreciate the difficulties of their system, if not to understand its fatal imperfections. The principal discussion was on the subject of co-operative production; and the question to which no satisfactory answer could be found was, how can co-operative production be carried on so as to avoid making of it an engine of oppression greater than any of the non-co-operative systems now in vogue. Is there any difference, so far as the outside world is concerned, between a thousand men banded together in a co-operative association for the making of shoes, and a shoe-making corporation employing a thousand laborers, save that the former, by superior efficiency, may possibly force down the price of shoes, and thus diminish the wages of non-co-operative shoemakers? The speaker at the congress sought to find a solution of this difficulty in universal organized co-operation, and with more or less indefiniteness pronounced in favor of state socialism. One speaker, indeed, Mr. G. E. Quirk, boldly faced the question, and declared that every co-operative society must be run in the interest of its members without regard to the interests of other people. "The primary purpose of all trade, commerce or manufacture," said Mr. Quirk, "is to make a profit, to benefit and enrich in the first instance those immediately concerned, and the men who profess to be actuated by any other motives, to be disinterested, and to sell their merchandise and manufacture their wares from pure philanthropy and from a desire to benefit their fellow men, are guilty of the most transparent hypocrisy and cant, and will have to tell their story to other than hard headed Britishers to be believed." Mr. Quirk's common sense utterance, however, met with no favor, and was condemned by nearly every delegate who spoke.

One peculiarity of the representatives of the co-operative idea who assembled in this congress was their curious confusion of thought about the meaning of the terms production and distribution. Production, according to their definition, ends with the process of manufacturing; the warehouse, the retail store, and other machinery for continuing the process of production until the goods reach consumers, are regarded by them as factors of distribution. Thus, they speak of a co-operative store as distributive co-operation; but of a co-operative factory as productive co-operation.

This confusion of thought renders them singularly unable to make any correct estimate of the merits of such co-operative schemes as have already been brought into successful operation. It is in evidence, for example, that the great co-operative stores, especially in London, have had considerable to do with the development of the sweating system, not only by their own efforts to obtain goods at constantly lower prices, but by forcing their competitors in business to cut wages down to the last possible penny. But the members of the congress regard this condition of affairs with perfect equanimity. For, they say, these stores are solving the problem of distribution, and can safely afford to leave the productive system to take care of itself. From men so disastrously ignorant of economic terminology little can be hoped in the way of clear thought and correct reasoning.

The evil possibilities of our system of jury trials were well illustrated in a case tried in Baltimore last week before Judge Duffy. The question was as to the validity of a will by which the testator, a wealthy Baltimore builder, absolutely disinherited his five children by a first wife, and left his entire property to the second wife and her children. The jury reported several times that there was no prospect of their agreeing, but Judge Duffy flatly refused to discharge them, declaring that he would keep them locked up for a month or more, if necessary, until they should find a verdict. As a result of this threat, the jury brought in a verdict sustaining the will.

It is hardly necessary to say that a verdict so obtained cannot by any possibility represent the honest, unbiased opinion of the entire jury. The effect of Judge Duffy's threat was that some members of the jury deliberately violated their oaths, and assented to a finding which in their hearts they believed to be unjust. If the plaintiffs in the case had sought to influence the jury by bribes or threats of violence, they would have done, in defiance of the law, precisely what Judge Duffy did as an administrator of the law.

Single Tax League Notes.

The clerk of the league reports the membership slowly but steadily increasing.

W. and M. W. M. say: "Have had a group working, which was organized before the foundation of the league. It has frequent meetings, with lively discussions and much interest manifested."

T. P. B. of Brooklyn thinks the group idea one of the best for propagating the faith, and has no doubt that it will be to many what he hopes it will be to him, a return to social pleasures that have been put aside to advance the single tax principles.

C. W. D. of Sailors' Saug Harbor, N. Y.,

writes to join the league and express his hearty approval of it. He says: "It would pain me to miss one word that Mr. George has written. I have read all of his published works and distributed six complete sets of them, together with five hundred tracts, among my acquaintances. I regard it an honor to help this cause, which is the cause of all humanity, by every means in my power."

ELECTRICITY IN PRODUCTION AND EXCHANGE.

The electric railway has begun to displace the horse car line and the more modern cable road in America. According to the *Electric Age* there are already one hundred and thirty miles of road in operation on this continent. Of this number twenty-one miles are in operation in Pennsylvania, sixteen miles in New York, ten in Ohio and eighty-three miles in New Jersey, Maryland, Colorado, Michigan, California, Alabama, Virginia, Kansas, Delaware, Rhode Island and Ontario combined. There are in course of construction, or contracted for, one hundred and fifty additional miles. These roads, constructed and in course of construction, are located in sixty-five towns and cities.

The various systems employ for the most part an overhead wire, which is tapped by the car as it moves along the track. The current used in one of these systems is of very low tension, so that there is no danger of fatal accidents from contact with the wires. In the storage battery system the car carries its own motive power along with it in the shape of electrical energy boxed up in storage batteries. This plan has been successfully tried in St. Louis and on the Fourth avenue line in New York city.

Another application of electricity to rail-roading has been made by the Cumberland valley railroad. The company has a car for the purpose of furnishing electric lights for mechanics' camp meetings, removing wrecks after dark, and various other purposes. It is a common box car, strongly built, and in which is an 8½ horse power boiler and engine, which runs a fifteen amp dynamo. Each lamp is 2,000 candle power. There is a reel containing three miles of insulated wire, and all the appliances necessary to supply lights at any reasonable distance from the track. It is said that it paid for itself in one year by the increased sale of tickets to picnics and camp meetings. The Pennsylvania railroad also hired it to light up the removal of a bad wreck at Duncannon. It is now proposed, too, to apply a method of welding metals by electricity to steel rails. A Baltimore electrician has invented a process by which the ends of the rails are firmly welded after they are laid on the track, and the joint is afterward made as hard as the rest of the rail. It is claimed that the joint can be made in half a minute. The proposal is to thus make rails a quarter of a mile long, and the consequent smooth travel would be said effect a great saving of wear and tear to rails, wheels and cars.

How simple is the operation of even the more intricate electrical appliances is shown by what has recently been done by some farmers in Michigan. There has grown up in a county in that state a telegraph system which might be generally extended throughout the rural districts everywhere. The system began by two farmers connecting their houses with a wire for their own convenience and operating their line with the ordinary Morse instruments. Gradually other farmers extended the line to their houses, and after a time the wire was run into the neighboring village. Seven years ago the combined farmers and a few village merchants organized themselves into a company, and it has since been extended until now it has sixty-five miles of wire and ninety offices, two-thirds of the latter being in farm houses, and nearly all the rest in stores where these farmers do their trading.

The use of electric lights by steamships has shortened the passage through the Suez canal very materially. In 1887 the average time of passage was only thirty-four hours. The fastest passage made by a steamer using the electric light was a trifle over fifteen hours. The American yacht *Namouna*, being permitted to steam faster than a large steamer, went through in thirteen hours and fifty-three minutes.

In other branches of industry the new force is being used more and more every day. Electric motors can now be classed as a new tool. Any one can run them with one half hour's previous instruction. Blowers, elevators for foundries, scrap shears and trip hammers for smith shops; flexible shafts, punches and drills in tank and boiler shops; paint mills, grind stones, transfer tables, cranes and hydraulic lifts everywhere, are some of the appliances which can be easily and economically operated by electric power. When wanted this power is instantly ready, and when shut off the expense ceases.

The Ways of the Puget Sound Lumber King.

WISTON, Wash. Ter.—Here is a clipping from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, describing the methods of the Puget sound loggers in keeping up the price of lumber:

At the regular monthly meeting of the Puget sound loggers' association last evening, it was unanimously decided to curtail one-third the output of logs for the balance of the year, commencing June 1. The matter was fully discussed, but there was no opposition to the measure, as it was the general opinion that too many logs were being put into the water to keep prices at a living rate. The opinion was generally expressed that if the heavy reduction made was not sufficient, a still further reduction would be made or the camps shut down entirely October 1, or before. The loggers' association represents three-fifths of the logging interest on the sound. The association has assurances from several loggers who are not members that they will also curtail their output. The action will make a difference of 30,000,000 feet in the output of the members of the association alone for the balance of the year.

This same combination of loggers have lately been circulating a petition praying congress not to abolish the lumber duty.

H. C. CROCKETT.

Commending Congressman Fitch.

HARLEM SINGLE TAX CLUB, Room 3, 217 West 125th street, New York, June 5.—The following resolutions were adopted at a regular meeting of the above named club, held this day:

Whereas, The Hon. Ashbel P. Fitch, representative from the Thirteenth congressional district, in which the club is situated, has displayed conspicuous boldness in taking a step in the right direction toward the removal of taxes from industry, in defiance of party dictation;

Resolved, That the Harlem single tax club warmly commends Mr. Fitch for his independence of thought and action; and on behalf of this club and in common with the 6,500 voters whose resolution to condemn his predecessor's refusal to consider any reduction of the tariff, which made possible the election of Mr. Fitch, we urge upon him a continued support of the Mills bill and hope that he may proceed from this to a more radical opposition to that colossal humbug, the protective tariff.

CHARLES H. MURRELL, Rec. Sec.

THE BEATING OF THE DRUMS.

The platform suits me perfectly. The issue is made plain enough.—[Ex-Governor Foster of Ohio (Republican).]

A protective tariff does not, and in the nature of the case cannot, fix the wages of labor.—[Fulton, Ill. Journal.]

Even the prohibitionists are in line with the rapidly growing sentiment of the country in favor of tariff reform.—[St. Paul Globe.]

The people of Philadelphia are building more houses every year than the people of any other city on this continent; but their distinguished congressmen all want lumber taxed.—[Philadelphia Record.]

The democratic hosts who were looking for an unequivocal declaration against the excessive taxation which robs both labor and commerce in order to build up monopolies, will not be disappointed.—[Boston Globe.]

It is confessed on all sides that the one vital issue of the contest just opened by the nomination of the democratic candidates is tariff revision and revenue reduction of 1889 constitute one issue and they are paramount.—[Philadelphia Times.]

This time, thanks to the southern brigadiers. The country owes a debt of gratitude, probably to them exclusively, and not to the president in this instance, for the explicit commitment of the democratic party to the cause of free trade.—[New York Tribune.]

The democratic platform, then, indorses Cleveland's clear and ringing message sent to congress on December 9, 1887, and so courageous and original that it fell like a thunderbolt upon the opposition and alarmed the most nervous of his own following.—[New York Star.]

To reaffirm the tariff plank of 1884 and approve it, together with Cleveland's message, and declare that it was correctly interpreted by the president, can mean only that the worse half is thrown away and the democracy is now back to the position of 1880 and demands a tariff for revenue only.—[Chicago Tribune (Rep.)]

It would have been a stupendous stultification for the national convention to nominate Mr. Cleveland upon a platform facing both ways on this vital issue, while the president and the democratic party in congress are moving together in one direction for tax reduction through tariff reform.—[New York World.]

The unanimous cry of the democratic party is formally recorded that the country must recognize its utterance as the positive demand for the immediate passage of the Mills free trade bill, and as equally positive indorsement of President Cleveland's free trade message.—[Philadelphia North American (Rep.)]

By its action on the closing day of its session the convention at St. Louis not only rounded out the work which it began so well with the nomination of Mr. Cleveland, but raised the democratic party clearly to the level of its candidate and established tariff reform as an unmistakable issue of the campaign.—[Boston Post.]

The democratic platform says that its terms do not mean free trade. That was to satisfy the protection sentiment of the country. It then indorses free trade. That was to satisfy President Cleveland and Chairman Mills. The voters will understand it as a free trade document, and they will make no mistake.—[Chicago Evening Journal (Rep.)]

The platform, with the Mills bill attachment, is free trade. Through the verbiage, verbosity and irrelevancies which it contains, the president's free trade message and the free trade bill of which Chairman Mills is the putative author, are plainly apparent as the issue of the campaign. The democrats want to make free trade the sole issue, and it will be the leading issue.—[Chicago Evening Journal (Rep.)]

The high tariff men argue that all the nations that have adopted high tariffs are getting rich. Why not all the nations adopted high tariff, and all get rich? Do you see the point? They could undoubtedly fill up the treasuries, but where would the money come from? It would come from the people; it would be a slick way of robbing the people. Our plan is absolute free trade, and let governments be supported by direct taxation.—[Boise City, Idaho, Republican.]

The principal features of the platform adopted at St. Louis were the indorsement of the free trade views as expressed in the message by President Cleveland, and also the indorsement of the Mills bill now pending in congress. The effect of this action was to make the issue clear and distinct. After years of trimming we have the vital issue, free trade or protection, before the American people, for them to decide.—[New York Press.]

It was inevitable that there should be a clash and a stubborn conflict over the tariff question at St. Louis. It does not follow from this fact that there is any serious division in the democratic party on that question. It was merely a last and desperate attempt of a small number of delegates, acting in the interest of a group of wealthy and influential monopolists, to bewilder the convention and to make the issue clear and distinct. After years of trimming we have the vital issue, free trade or protection, before the American people, for them to decide.—[New York Press.]

Such early and apparently hearty unanimity upon a ticket and a definite policy of tariff revision and surplus reduction will give the democrats advantage at the start. They will enter upon the contest with strong candidates, with an aim and a purpose, and with the immense power of the federal treasury at their backs. It would seem that nothing but the leadership of such a candidate as Judge Gresham and a liberal and progressive tariff and tax reduction policy could save the republicans.—[Springfield Republican (Rep.)]

The cut and dried programme of the St. Louis convention, so far as Mr. Cleveland is concerned, has been carried out. He has been renominated without a sign of opposition. His renomination settles the issue of the campaign, which will be the tariff question. Mr. Cleveland and his party are committed to a free trade programme by his message, by the Mills bill by their renomination. The republican party with all its leaders is the party of protection, the party of the tariff. There can be no mistaking the issue of the presidential campaign in 1888.—[Philadelphia News.]

The republicans are most frightened about the tariff agitation leading in time to absolute free trade. That is just what tariff reform will lead to, and the reason of it is we are supporting the position of the democratic party. Tariff reform will lead to the adoption of the single tax on land values and the abolition of all taxation on the products of labor. Then, and not till then, will monopoly be destroyed, and a man willing to work have an opportunity to do so without paying tribute to monopoly for the privilege.—[Grand Rapids (Mich.) Workman.]

American workmen are coming in competition with the pauper labor of Europe very fast. Nearly a million immigrants arrive in this country every year, and nine out of ten are poor, while all at once enter into competition with the American. While our immigration laws remain as they are, the manufacturer will obtain his labor in the cheapest market. Then why should he be "protected" by tariff laws which compel the American consumer to purchase many of the necessities of life in the dearest market of the world—the home market? Our high tariff laws are not only cruelly burdensome, but are impudently inconsistent.—[Salt Lake Herald.]

The great struggle at St. Louis has been over the platform, and over a single one of its component parts. This struggle began when the president's message was delivered, and it has continued to the present moment. The result could hardly have been otherwise, because if Mr. Cleveland is to be renominated, he must be taken as he is. The democrats have taken their stand, not without some contest, but yet manfully and openly. What will the re-

publicans do when their turn comes? We need not anticipate what particular form of words they will employ in their platform. It is not what they may say at Chicago, but what they will do in Washington, that will be decisive.—[New York Evening Post.]

Republicans will rejoice with the free traders that they have at last thrown off the mask and determined to make an open fight. If the sentiment of the country is in favor of a revenue tariff and against protection, then Messrs. Cleveland and Thurman will be elected. If not, the republicans will achieve a victory in November that will settle the vexed question for a generation and start the country upon a new era of prosperity.—[Pittsburg Commercial-Gazette (Rep.)]

After all, the democracy have advanced on the tariff reform road in spite of themselves. The logic of events has proven stronger than their disinclination to show their hands, and during this canvass, at least, it will be next to impossible for them to refer to their party as anything but one that is on the road to tariff reduction, if not free trade. Now let the republican party lock horns on this great issue, and next fall the electors of the republic will have the satisfaction of knowing whether a majority of the American people believe in taxation for revenue only, or taxation for the purpose of giving one portion of the people an advantage over all the others.—[Detroit Evening News.]

LOUISIANA FARMERS. Denouncing the Tariff and Working Along Toward the Single Tax.

VILLE PLATTE, La., June 2.—The following resolutions, passed at a meeting of the Farmers' union here, will show how we stand on the tariff issue, and how we are edging toward direct taxation—the single tax.

Whereas, one of the avowed objects of the organization is to demand equal rights for all, special privileges for none, and the public domain have been heavily taxed for the benefit of the favored few till it has come to pass that we are on the verge of ruin. Under the guise which this imposition on the people has assumed, we condemn it.

1. The protective tariff by which we are made to pay from twenty-five to seventy-five per cent more than the natural market price of nearly every article of the merchandise which we buy.

2. The national banking system by which we are forced to furnish money to corporations to do business on, free of interest, while we are obliged to pay as high as forty per cent for the money we borrow of these banks.

3. Millions of acres of the public domain have been donated to railroad companies without consideration, while these corporations have been empowered to tax at their pleasure the people in the sections traversed by these roads, giving the favored railroad, for instance, an hundred million dollars in money; therefore, be it

Resolved by the Ville Platte farmers' union, that we are opposed to a protective tariff, because a restricted market reduces the price of what we sell and increases the price of what we buy; and, second, because it can by no possibility increase the wages of American workmen, as claimed, because it does not restrict the importation of underpaid European laborers, and thus increases the competition for the wages of American workmen.

Resolved, That we are opposed to the duties on imports for revenue purposes, because it is an insidious mode of taxation under which the average buyer cannot tell how much of the price of merchandise is tax, and how much is the market price of the goods; because, second, it is a system which gives rise to fraudulent importations, false swearing and the kindred evils; and because, third, the necessity of raising revenue by such means of sea coast and frontier gives rise to the employment of an army of officers by land and a navy of revenue cutters by sea.

Resolved, That banking forms no part of the real business of government, and that we demand the early cancellation of all outstanding bonds, the retirement of bank notes passed thereon, and the issuing of non-interest bearing notes in amounts to suit the legitimate demands of trade and no more.

Resolved, That the right to domain belongs of right to the American people, and the granting any portion thereof to corporations in preference to the working farmer, thereby enabling the non-worker to rack rent the worker, who has no other means of support, is contrary to natural right and justice, and to the spirit of American institutions.

Resolved, That according to majority and minority reports of the people's money paid for the building of the Pacific railroad, and the power to tax at pleasure the people of the section traversed by the roads, ruthlessly exercised for years, amply compensate the incorporators for any possible services rendered, and they can well afford to forego further exactions on an indulgent public by surrendering the roads and franchises to the proper owners.

As illustrating the way in which tariff discussion leads toward the single tax, it is worth mentioning that when these resolutions had been debated and the conclusion reached that taxation of imports was the most objectionable method of raising revenue, the question, "Upon what shall taxes be levied?" arose, and I was invited to address the meeting on the subject of "direct taxation."

When I began my remarks, the road it is an easy matter to show them the way to the logical end.

D. C. DAVIS,

Secretary V. P. Farmers' Union.

Why Not Lay Mains at Public Expense and Pay for Them Out of the Enhanced Land Value?

Toronto Globe. The village of York sets an example to Toronto in compelling the owners of the property benefited to pay for the water mains laid opposite their property. Toronto has been plundered of some hundreds of thousands of dollars in the past to pay for water mains that were laid in advance of the need, and that would not have been laid till some years afterward if there had not been speculative land grabbers to conciliate. Many miles of pipe have been laid through unproductive property to benefit somebody's "radical" idea. If the intervening property had been assessed for the water mains the owners could not have afforded to keep it back from the market. Our present system lays out the hands of the vacant lot owner and should be a lesson to Toronto. To say, as now, when there was difficulty in getting people to take the city water, there was something to be said in favor of charging the cost of the mains on the general taxes. Now that excuse is gone for everybody is anxious to get the water. Chairman Bonstead should signalize his year of office by introducing a system by which the whole cost of all mains below a certain diameter and a fair proportion of the cost of the larger mains should be charged on the property benefited. To be perfectly fair the assessments should be changed all round so that from this time forth the whole of the city should be assessed for water mains on the frontage plan.

How Charity Works.

W. Alexander Johnson in the Open Court. When the Chicago home for self supporting women (which itself is not self supporting) was organized a few months ago, a prominent employer of girl labor who was asked for a subscription said: "If you will board my girls for \$2 a week I will give you \$500," and he could well afford to do so, for he could at once have reduced the pay of some hundred girls by enough to make up the amount of his subscription in a few weeks. The need of the poor and the rich is not charity in the sense of alms, it is justice—justice carried to the utmost limit of our dealings and measures. The single tax is not only to the individuals, but to the race. This justice done there would still be room for a very noble kind of helpfulness, but it would hardly take the form of soup tickets or the pauper deal at the office of the county agent.

for one hour the Democrat is supposed to be hostile to any address in the United States or Canada.

E. W. Ross is
 Oh, yes, he
 And benevolence
 We'll help
 And, though
 We've put
 Would a
 Against the
 But pay
 dig
 We must
 Teach him
 his
 Protect I
 the g
 And w
 We
 his vic
 can
 And we f
 the
 the gove
 livin
 T
 I am on
 the fam
 for int
 ible per
 and may
 an obtain
 is due.
 (and this)
 nise shou
 row, we a
 it is the g
 and can
 row viol
 did its di
 making
 prov
 de
 ill be t
 did victu
 takes a c
 ous in
 critical e
 on sect
 of na
 on crushed
 would be
 in a qu
 duties
 a quest
 is re
 be as
 is, w
 be sou
 during f
 we wag
 them
 ous li
 eals w
 to prote
 tion" I
 that
 that,
 ction
 ous of
 abolish
 did id
 are f
 a quest
 on' ac
 It was
 to be wh
 st in
 2. He
 mine
 we tar
 entered
 the g
 teeth
 we cau
 and ho
 we w
 was I
 ceasing
 on ex
 rs of
 is try
 is in
 he ca
 e ut
 e will
 e sou
 we t
 pre
 per
 whole
 s of
 ives
 one c
 the
 the
 deen
 com
 is the
 you
 erati
 e
 t
 au
 e
 outh
 stial
 vity
 ntly
 wh
 wh
 mme
 ily
 onl
 "up
 p
 c
 if
 e
 hav
 w
 p
 p
 At
 A

